



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2011

No. 103

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BUERKLE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
July 12, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANN MARIE BUERKLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

OBAMAISM HAS MADE AMERICA WORSE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we are worse off now than we were in 2008. The country is suffering through an economic recession with more long-term unemployment than during the Great Depression.

The economy was in bad shape, but this administration has made it worse. The unconstitutional government takeover of health care created a cloud of uncertainty for small business own-

ers, stalling job growth. Our health care system was in trouble before, but this administration has made it worse.

Our country is spiraling toward a domestic energy crisis thanks to the administration's insistence on punishing U.S. oil companies. The price of energy was high before, but this administration makes it worse. Americans are becoming used to living with the word "crisis." Under Obamaism, crisis has become the new status quo.

The President admits we're on a bumpy road. But, Mr. President, this road is full of potholes. The national debt is expected to equal 101 percent of the economy in 10 years. Unemployment is around 9.2 percent. Home sales have declined. The number of food stamp recipients has skyrocketed.

Over the past 3 years, we have witnessed an administration set on entitling people and paying them not to work as opposed to helping businesses hire people to work. We are worse off now than we were before the President stepped foot on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

We are stuck in this hole because White House policies have been toxic to this country's job creators. Businesses do not operate like the government does. They don't function under short-term budgets. They don't plan for the next 6 days or 6 months, like our government does. Business owners want a plan. They want to know what will happen next.

Under this cloud of uncertainty, businesses face ObamaCare's employer mandate and an onslaught of costly government relations. This leaves them with few choices: hold tight and wait it out, comply with government oppression and suffer, or shut down and move overseas.

Coming up on this bumpy road is a domestic energy shortage. The White House seeks to punish the energy of today and tomorrow in favor of potential energy after our lifetimes. An en-

ergy agenda that is synonymous with stall, obstruct, discourage, and penalize will only devastate the economy further and force more businesses and jobs to go away.

We've seen the administration slow-walk the approval process for offshore drilling permits despite lifting the moratorium. The delays have been costly, so costly that rigs have left the Gulf of Mexico never to return, and those jobs will not return either.

The coming domestic energy shortage will be partly due to the White House's desire to help foreign nations with their domestic energy instead of maximizing our own God-given natural resources. When the President told Brazil that America would help expand its offshore drilling operations and be one of its best customers, he sent a clear message: He doesn't support U.S. oil, U.S. companies, or U.S. workers. Each day that passes without a decision on the Keystone XL pipeline, a pipeline that will transport oil shale from our stable neighbor to the north right down to my congressional district in Texas, is another day that the White House pivots on U.S. energy jobs. Meanwhile, China is eager and ready to be Canada's customer if we snub Canada on the pipeline.

The White House has a none-from-below mentality. We need an all-of-the-above strategy that encourages use of our natural resources and puts Americans back to work. The administration has mastered the art of turning a crisis into an opportunity to shove unpopular policies through.

Over a year after the Deepwater Horizon explosion, the administration has come as close as it can to shutting down operations in the Gulf. The impact, 12,000 jobs have been lost.

Are we better off today than we were in 2008? No. Our economy is still in a crisis of uncertainty.

The answers under Obamaism are to increase government control over our

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4855

lives and raise taxes on people who pay taxes. This plan is an attack on freedom. More government spending and control is the problem, not the solution. As Senator RUBIO has said, instead of raising taxes, we should have more taxpayers. More new taxpayers under the concept of developing more businesses, more jobs also yield more taxpayers. This will create revenue.

The White House has operated under crisis management. The doctrine of Obamaism with its expansion of the government has made America worse. It is time for new hope, new change, and a new American day.

And that's just the way it is.

CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT IS BIGGEST AMERICAN PROBLEM

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, we are in the 10th year of the Bush tax cuts and the third year of the Obama tax cuts. Taxes today are at the lowest percentage of our national economy since 1950; and, of course, that preexists a few things like Medicare, homeland security, massive spending on wars overseas, et cetera.

Yet last Friday, with this very, very light tax burden, we had the official unemployment numbers. They were horrible. But guess what. The reality is worse than the numbers. There are about 20 million people, not 16 million people, unemployed, looking for work, or underemployed. So I guess all we need to do is cut taxes more and cut spending and we will have an economic boom. Yes, we will have a boom, like the boom of an imploding economy. Just like the last 10 years, the worst job creation since the Great Depression under this theory that tax cuts solve every problem.

Now the President's response on Friday was, not surprisingly, continue tax cuts. The new one he has adopted is the Social Security tax holiday. But don't worry, we will make Social Security whole. If we cut their income, we've got to make the trust fund whole. We'll borrow \$110 billion from China. We'll put it into the Social Security trust fund and everybody will get \$15 or \$20 a week, and that'll solve the problems of this economy. Of course, it doesn't do much for the people who aren't working, and it's not going to create jobs. That's his big solution.

Number two solution: more job-killing free trade agreements. Oh, that's great.

Patent reform. Yeah, maybe some day.

And then at the very end, oh, we should have a little bitty infrastructure bank. Okay. Great.

Now, the Republicans on Thursday, they preceded all this and one-upped him. They proposed that the United States of America, with crumbling highways, falling-down bridges, and obsolete transit systems, cut investment

in infrastructure by 35 percent. So the construction industry that has today 16 percent unemployment, under the Republican plan, 25 percent unemployment. That's great. That's going to work, too. Oh, yes, and more tax cuts.

You know, we lack the will around here to address our Nation's greatest problems, not the means. Chronic unemployment is the greatest problem in this country. If we solve chronic unemployment, a quarter of the deficit goes away because those people aren't collecting unemployment benefits, food stamps and other things they need just to survive, and they are working and paying taxes.

Now, how about canceling some of these stupid tax cuts, particularly the Social Security tax holiday? Let's not borrow \$110 billion from China for people to dribble way in \$20-a-week payments. Let's take that \$110 billion and build things in America with American workers and buy American requirements.

□ 1010

We could put 4 million or 5 million people to work. Let's cancel the tax cuts for people earning over \$200,000 a year—the job creators—who are pretty undertaxed right now and who have record savings and wealth. If they contributed a little bit, that would be about another 1 million jobs if we put that \$23 billion a year into investments in infrastructure. These aren't just construction jobs. They're engineering jobs; they're manufacturing jobs; they're small business suppliers. We need an investment-driven recovery. For too long, we've been trying under both Bush and under Obama to have a borrowed money, consumption-driven recovery.

Ain't going to work. Not good long term.

Instead of indebting our kids and giving them nothing but current consumption, let's have something that's investment-driven that will provide benefits for generations to come with a 21st century infrastructure for this country.

H.R. 1861: INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, while deliberations continue on dealing with our \$14.3 trillion debt and while deliberations continue on raising the debt ceiling, Americans are very concerned about where we're going.

June unemployment at 9.2 percent and a growth of only 18,000 jobs translates into a meager 360 jobs per State. Now, when you look at how many high school students graduated in June, that's 3.7 million. Colleges graduated 1.7 million. Those 360 jobs barely equal the size of a typical large American

high school graduating class, and certainly barely covers students at one typical college per State with a typical major. No wonder Americans are worried about our economy when so many youth are entering the job market only to find there are no jobs.

So while our leaders on both sides of the aisle are deliberating—and, unfortunately, too much of this immediately becomes a battle of words—let's keep in mind that one way to balance America's budget, one very important way to deal with America's debt, is to grow jobs. For each 1 percent decline in unemployment, it's \$90 billion per year in Federal revenue. That's a decrease in unemployment compensation. That's an increase in Federal revenues. That's 1.5 million jobs for every 1 percent decline in unemployment.

Let me quote our colleague from across the building here, Senator RUBIO, who said: This is not about increasing taxes; it's about increasing taxpayers. And this could do it.

Now, the cost per job in the failed stimulus bill was at least \$278,000 based upon \$660 billion spent. Of course, that number per job increases dramatically and rapidly if you include the interest paid on that stimulus bill, which takes us over the \$1 trillion mark. That sort of approach is not going to work, and if we open our eyes, we can all honestly admit that. Increasing unemployment is not going to decrease the Federal debt or deficit. We have to grow our way out of this.

Now, a bill that I've introduced and that several colleagues in a bipartisan way have signed onto as cosponsors—and I ask my colleagues to join on as cosponsors—is H.R. 1861. This bill would allow us to say, instead of sending \$129 billion a year to OPEC for foreign aid, to buy their oil, we drill for and we use our own. It would yield somewhere between \$2.2 trillion and \$3.7 trillion over a 30-year period in Federal revenues, not from raising taxes, but from using the standard royalties and lease agreements that come from this. It starts out as a crawl and increases to a walk and then into a run as this money comes through.

What we do in this bill is about growth in America. It isn't just talking about it. It's putting our money where our jobs are because it leads to 1.2 million jobs annually based upon estimates of the American Energy Alliance. That's jobs making steel, making steel pipes, wire, software, technology. It's jobs for the roughnecks. It's the steelworkers, the electricians and the laborers who work on these rigs. It's jobs for those who take this oil and convert it into gasoline, and it's jobs for those who have to put together all the infrastructure to make that happen.

Beyond that, what we do is we dedicate these funds into the infrastructure which America needs. According to the American Society for Civil Engineers, we need over \$2 trillion to deal with our current infrastructure needs. Many

States find that 25 percent of their roads and bridges are structurally deficient, which is unsafe; but for every \$1 billion we spend on our infrastructure, it yields 38,000 jobs. Those jobs are for operating engineers and laborers and carpenters or electricians and engineers and for those who make concrete and steel and all the things that go with what we need for our roads, our highways, our bridges, our locks, our dams, our water and sewer systems.

Let's grow our way back to prosperity. Let's stop saying we're going to send money to OPEC and watch them grow. Let's stop just pointing fingers and blaming and complaining about China. We have the tools here in America to make this happen. So, while our leaders are over at the White House, arguing about how to take care of the debt, let's not forget that, overall, Americans are saying that one way to grow out of this debt is to grow more jobs, to grow more taxpayers, not just to find ways of taxing them. We can do this.

Again, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1861, where we can do this. Let's not talk about jobs, and let's not complain about it. Americans know when the wool is being pulled over their eyes, and Americans know when they're working. Let's truly help them out and get jobs back on the table.

FIGHTING FOR PEACE EVERY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, in April of the year 2004, my staff came to me with a memo, asking if I wanted to give a Special Order speech on some issue of which I can't remember the subject. My answer at that time was, no, I didn't want to speak on that issue, but I did want to deliver a 5-minute speech that day and every day thereafter, when it was possible, to express my opposition to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and to express my belief that there is a smarter way to achieve our national security goals.

So, Madam Speaker, since that day, I've stood here in this spot to say over and over again that these wars are eroding our spiritual core, bankrupting us morally and fiscally, teaching our children that warfare is the new normal. I have delivered these speeches as a member of the majority and the minority, when the President was a member of my party and when he was not, and today, I am doing it for the 400th time.

When I began, the war in Iraq was still quite popular, as was the President who launched it, but we spoke out anyway, refusing to bend on principle because we knew that we did not belong there. My colleagues Representative BARBARA LEE and Representative MAXINE WATERS and I called ourselves the "Triad." We started the Out of Iraq

Caucus, and we forced the first House vote to bring our troops home. Along the way, I visited Iraq, and my opinion was confirmed against that very war, but at the same time, it increased my admiration for our troops. Gradually, the tide of public opinion turned. President Bush lost the confidence of the American people, and eventually had to start winding down the war. I don't believe that would have happened unless a few lonely voices had dared to be heard in those early, early days.

I am proud of what we have accomplished, but I am also very frustrated because nearly a decade after the first American boots hit the ground in Afghanistan, here we are—still at war, still occupying sovereign countries on missions that aren't making us safer or advancing our interests. The cost has been devastating. Over 6,100 Americans are dead, and thousands more civilians have died for the cause of their so-called "liberation." Thousands of U.S. servicemembers have come home but may never be the same, either because of physical wounds or mental health trauma, which can, with the physical and the mental health, destroy lives just as well.

In addition to the staggering \$3.2 trillion price tag that has piled up over the last 10 years, I don't think we've even begun to come to grips with the resources that the VA will need for the next 50 or so years to meet the responsibility we have to our veterans as a result of these wars.

Madam Speaker, I've said it over and over again that I'm not suggesting we abandon the people of Afghanistan and Iraq. Anti-war doesn't mean anti-engagement or anti-security. The underlying principle behind my 400 speeches has been that we need a completely different approach to protecting America—one that emphasizes diplomacy, reconciliation and peaceful conflict resolution.

□ 1020

From the beginning, I have been pushing my own solution called SMART Security, fighting terrorism with better intelligence, with a stronger nuclear nonproliferation program, with humanitarian and economic aid that will give hope to people around the world, with less spending on weapon systems and more on homeland security, human rights monitoring, and energy independence.

Most importantly, SMART Security insists that war is an absolute last resort because, Madam Speaker, for the sake of the future of the human race, we must and we can figure out a way to resolve our differences without resorting to war and violence. I will continue to do this for the remaining 1½ years that I will be in Congress, giving as many of these speeches as I can. And Madam Speaker, I will not rest until we finally bring our troops home and we adopt the SMART Security approach to preventing war and preserving peace so that my grandchildren

and your grandchildren and their grandchildren will have a peaceful, productive world to live in in the future.

LET'S GET SERIOUS ABOUT THE DEBT CRISIS

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

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Speaker, let me help this body interpret how the American people see this debt crisis. Now some of you may question how I can, with this accent, provide an interpretation. Well, let me show you.

Americans have a keen understanding of how credit cards work. They know that each card holds a limit on it, and this limit is the borrowing limit on that particular card. And it is a fact that when one reaches the limit on his or her card, that they are unable to borrow more money or charge more at that time.

Now it is not factual to say, however, that when one maxes out his credit card, that he is in default personally, or in layman's terms, that he is bankrupt. No. When one reaches his limit, you simply cannot use the card anymore. If you want to continue to use the card, you need to pay down on the principal amount that is owed.

If and when you reach this unfortunate circumstance, you and your family are required to live within your means. As long as you can continue to pay the interest on the card and the bills that you have accrued, then you are not in jeopardy of defaulting. Of course you can only do this if you're employed and you have income, unlike the approximately 9.2 percent of Americans out there who are looking for us to do everything we can to help create private sector jobs.

So this is where we are. Look, I don't believe if we fail to raise the debt ceiling that we will default. What I do believe is not raising the debt ceiling will finally require Congress to make the tough decisions necessary to restore fiscal sanity to our Federal Government. It will force Congress to understand that at this time we need to live within our means. Why? Because going back to our layman's term, if the Federal Government was a person, that person is not unemployed, they still have a job, unlike the approximately 9.2 percent of Americans I spoke earlier about. So if we still have a job, that means we're still getting a paycheck. That paycheck is currently sufficient to pay our bills.

After 2 years, where the President and previous Congresses spent like they were going out of style, the President is starting to understand that we have spent too much. What he hasn't realized yet—and I hope he does—is that we don't have a revenue problem here; we have a spending problem.

Now, I know that we would like to spend more on things we like. That is human nature. But the reason so many of us are opposed to increasing taxes is

that our constituents are opposed to increasing taxes. Make no mistake about it: If the American people believe that an increase in taxes would once and for all eliminate our debt problems here in this country, they would support it.

But, you see, this institution has a credibility problem—in fact, the entire Federal Government has a credibility problem with the American people. The American people do not have confidence in our ability to be prudent with their tax dollars. Do you blame them? When over the course of the last 2 years we have spent over \$3 trillion on money, on stimuluses and bailouts, promising that we would increase their opportunity to be more financially secure, and of course that didn't happen. The proof is in the pudding. We spent the money, and guess what? No results.

We have a spending problem. Why? Because so many politicians here who have been here for a long time believe that everything in the budget is a need, not a want. As a parent of a young child, I'm constantly having to explain to him the difference between needs and wants. So the longtime politicians here believe that government is the solution to everything. Well, my friends, believe you me, some of us know it's not, and the vast majority of people know it's not. Trust me. Trust me.

We must get serious. Washington is not an elastic piggybank that is able to continue to fund everyone's wants. Let's get serious. Let's quit spending what we don't have. Let's restore credibility. And we do this by cutting spending through prioritizing. It is that simple. Restore credibility, restore trust. Get down to creating certainty, reducing redtape and creating jobs.

DEBT AND RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, last week, I tried to point out that there was a serious meeting going on in the White House last weekend between the President and our congressional leaders to point out that we were facing a serious crisis and that we had to do something to make certain that the President felt sure that we would increase the debt ceiling and that we would make certain that we did stop this unnecessary spending. And of course the question of revenues has always been a part of the debate.

What I was trying to do was to point out that on one side it appeared the issue was that we shouldn't tax those people that created jobs—and these are people, as people have pointed out, who are the wealthiest corporations that have record profits, and of course the wealthy that have really had the lowest tax rates and have received more money in the last decade than in the history of the country.

And I was really trying to say that, since the vulnerable and the poor did

not have any lobbyists or voices to debate this issue, that when we talk about entitlements, that when we talk about Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, these are not just political labels. The Medicaid, of course we're talking about the vulnerable, the poor, and those who are sick. Medicare, we're talking about the aged that need help. I was also pointing out that, unfortunately, Social Security has become the main income for so many Americans. And we have veterans that are coming home, we have the jobless, the homeless, the hopeless. And even though they did not have a lobbyist to say, hey, I want to have a seat at that table, that I called to all of our spiritual leaders, since I knew that in every religion there was a good Samaritan aspect which really ended up saying, just do the right thing. I didn't put politics in it, I didn't put party labels in it. And I wasn't just talking to Christians and ministers and Catholics and Protestants; I was reaching out to the rabbis, to the imams, to the Buddhists, to the Mormons, to the Muslims and saying that in every Scripture, in every religious document, taking care of the vulnerable and those who can't take care of themselves, that that moral issue should be on the table.

Well, as a result of that, some people thought that instead of just a good Samaritan, I would ask what Jesus would do. And I just want to make it clear: I haven't the slightest idea what he would do, but my very dear friend, Governor Huckabee, said one of the things that Jesus would do would be to pay his taxes. And, of course, that was something that reminded me.

□ 1030

He also went to Deuteronomy. And he said it on TV: "For the Lord your God will bless you as He has promised, and you will lend to many nations but will borrow from none. And you will rule over many nations but none will rule over you."

Well, again, that scored for the good Governor, but however, when you have got a \$14.3 trillion debt, it's kind of late for that message to have a strong impact.

But what I want to make clear is that no matter what religion you are, it appears to me that what we're talking about are two sides of sincere Americans that do recognize that this is not just saying that the sky may fall. All economists agree that there are various ways to do it, and we cannot just cut back spending in order to resolve this serious economic problem we have.

As a matter of fact, we have to be very sensitive when we do cut back spending that we don't create an addition to the unemployment and those that provide services to the disadvantaged. And I am talking specifically about our hospitals, about our social workers. Because there is no one in this Chamber that doesn't believe that the homeless and the sick, those that

are disabled and those that are dependent on these programs should be ignored as we protect those people who, for whatever reason, have not participated in the creation of those jobs, even though we all are waiting.

But more importantly, we have not heard any complaints from the wealthiest of Americans that more equity should be involved in our taxing system. When the billionaires can say that their secretaries have a higher tax rate than they do, it means that we have a responsibility not to raise taxes but at least to close the inequity that exists that would raise revenue.

So when we do get home it seems to me that we would say this is not a Democratic issue, this is not a Republican issue alone, it is a moral issue.

Thank you, Governor Huckabee.

HONORING COLONEL GERALD F. RUSSELL OF CENTRE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a true patriot, humanitarian, and all-around great American, Colonel Gerald F. Russell, United States Marine Corps, of Centre County, Pennsylvania. Colonel Gerald F. Russell is a combat veteran of Guadalcanal, Korea, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and World War II, including the Battle of Iwo Jima, which remains today a seminal event in our Nation's history.

May 1 was Colonel Russell's birthday. I use this time to celebrate his service to our country and his thankless contributions to our local communities of central Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, May 1, 1916, was the beginning of a long life of service. In 1940, Colonel Gerald F. Russell graduated from Boston College, enlisted in the first Marine Corps Office Candidates Class, and later that year was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps. He was assigned to the 11th Marines, 1st Marine Division, Parris Island, South Carolina, and then promoted to first lieutenant.

In September 1942, Colonel Russell landed in the assault waves on Guadalcanal in the first U.S. offensive of World War II. He was promoted to captain that very same day, assigned as battery commander ship, he was hit by Japanese aircraft during landing, which later sank. Colonel Russell suffered shrapnel wounds during the campaign, was not evacuated, and soon contracted malaria. Shortly after, he moved with the 1st Marine Division to Melbourne, Australia, and only returned to the U.S. to recover.

From 1943 to 1945, Russell was assigned to attend the United States Marine Corps Command and Staff College. He was assigned to the 5th Marine Division, Camp Lejeune, as artillery battalion exec, promoted to major, and

transferred from artillery to infantry. With 5th Marine Division, he transferred to Hawaii as infantry battalion executive officer. As battalion executive officer, Russell landed in the third assault wave on Iwo Jima, Red Beach One, where he observed the historic flag raising.

Despite wounds to his face and being evacuated, Russell volunteered to stay and lead the battalion after his commander went down. On the 10th day, Russell was elevated to infantry battalion commander, one of the youngest battalion commanders in World War II, and so served the remainder of the campaign.

Russell commanded one of two units to land in Japan for occupation, at Kyushu, and provided protection for the U.S. technical teams covering the atomic bomb site at Nagasaki. Commander Russell accepted the surrender of the Tsushima Islands off the coast of the Japanese mainland. He was then returned to the U.S. and was assigned to the Staff Officers Basic School in Quantico, Virginia, where he served as instructor.

In 1949, Russell was assigned to the 1st Marine Division, Korea, where he served as commander of frontline infantry battalion for 8 months, and as chief of the advisory group of a frontline Korean Marine brigade for 8 months. When he returned to the U.S., he was assigned to the Marine Corps Research and Development Staff in Quantico, Virginia.

In 1952, Russell was assigned to staff, U.S. European Command, Paris, France. That year, he returned to Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., and later transferred to Quantico, assigned as director of the Amphibious Warfare School. He transferred to Camp Lejeune, then appointed commanding officer of the 8th Marine Infantry Regiment. Later, Russell was transferred to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to command U.S. Ground Defense Force during the early difficulties with Cuba.

In 1967, Colonel Russell was transferred to Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., where he served as Head Marine Corps Division of Morale Services until his retirement from the Marine Corps in 1968.

Russell retired from the Marine Corps on a Friday and started work on Monday as the assistant to the provost at Penn State University. While at Penn State, Colonel Russell served as assistant to the provost, assistant to President Oswald, and assistant secretary for the Penn State Board of Trustees, assistant professor, and assistant to dean of College of Health and Physical Education, and as associate dean until his retirement in 1987.

Since his retirement from Penn State, Colonel Russell has continued as a tireless community volunteer, volunteer advocate, and is known throughout central Pennsylvania and beyond.

Today, Colonel Russell serves as a member of the Centre County United

Way Board of Directors, chairman of the Centre County United Way Day of Caring, and remains active in various efforts, which include the Pennsylvania Special Olympics, Centre County Toys for Tots, and many other programs that benefit our community.

After a long and distinguished career, Colonel Russell has a Republic of Korea Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Star with "V" for Valor, the Navy Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, Purple Heart Medal with two gold stars, U.S. Presidential Citation with four stars, Korean Presidential Unit Citation with three stars, Navy Meritorious Unit Citation, the Defense Medal, Asiatic Pacific Medal with three stars, World War II Victory Medal, National Defense Medal, World War II Japan Occupation Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, Korean Service Medal, among others, for his eminent service to our country.

A decorated veteran with almost three decades of active service, today Colonel Russell is one of just three living regimental commanders of Iwo Jima. The Battle of Iwo Jima served as a watershed moment for the United States in World War II. After capturing Iwo Jima, U.S. Forces were able to have a staging ground for the aerial assault that would help defeat the Japanese Empire.

I want to thank Colonel Russell for his service to this great Nation. Happy birthday, Colonel Russell.

This great victory did not come without great sacrifice. More than 70,000 Marines participated in the Battle of Iwo Jima, 17,372 Marines were wounded and 5,931 Marines made the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation.

Through a life of sacrifice and service to others, Colonel Gerald F. Russell today stands as a living memory of those who lost their lives in WWII and the many others who've given the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation.

Again, thank you for your service to this Nation.

CONGRESSWOMAN WOOLSEY'S 400TH SPECIAL ORDER ON IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today, first of all, to pay tribute to a true champion for peace and justice, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY. Her leadership is reflected in the fact that today marks the 400th occasion on which she has spoken on the House floor against the ongoing war in Iraq and the war in Afghanistan.

Today is really a landmark not only because of Congresswoman WOOLSEY's outstanding commitment to ending the wars we are engaged in, but also because she is my good friend. And she will be retiring at the end of this term. I was truly honored to be by her side when she announced her retirement after 20 years of bold and visionary service in this House and serving her district. It was a bittersweet occasion. But I know she will do wonderful things in the next chapter of her life.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY should really be commended for being an unparalleled leader and a guiding light, a truly guiding light in Congress for peace, for SMART Security, and for justice.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank Congresswoman WOOLSEY for her unwavering leadership and commitment to end the unsustainable wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. She introduced the very first resolution calling for us to bring our young brave men and women home from Iraq. I believe she pulled together then, what, 130 votes maybe for that resolution? And I want to remind you, this was a time when this body was, quite frankly, very timid in its opposition to the war.

□ 1040

She broke that silence, and I have to thank you for that very historic moment, Congresswoman WOOLSEY. Now we must ensure that the 45,000 United States troops and our military contractors who remain in Iraq leave Iraq at the end of this year, as stated in our Nation's Status of Forces Agreement with Iraq.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY's fight to end these wars is directly tied to, really, the impasse that we are facing over our Nation's debt limit, which we are discussing today. She has tirelessly reminded this body, time and time again, that in order to pay for these wars, the United States has taken on incredible debt. This reckless spending and resulting debt are now being used by many in a dangerous political game which threatens the economic future of our country.

Allowing our government to default on this Nation's legal obligations would threaten every American's economic security, it would devastate people's retirement savings, and it would cripple an already struggling housing market.

The truth is, and Congresswoman WOOLSEY always reminds us of this, is that raising the debt ceiling should be really a very simple thing. This should be a straightforward vote to allow the United States Treasury to fund all of the programs and obligations of the entire government that are already in the law, very simple.

Republicans in the House have already passed a \$9 trillion increase in the national debt. And now, instead of working to fund the programs that they already voted to authorize, Republicans are playing a high-stakes game of chicken with the safety and security of every single American so that they can protect the massive tax breaks for the super rich, Big Oil and, of course, hedge funds. They have taken an incredibly irresponsible position that protecting tax breaks for the super rich and Wall Street is more important than protecting the United States Government and Main Street from defaulting on our debt.

And, again, Congresswoman WOOLSEY has been a leader in protecting Social

Security, and I want to remind all of us today that Social Security and Medicare did not create the national debt, and that is really unconscionable to ask our most vulnerable communities to be the ones who must bear the burden of balancing our budget.

It was the Republicans who told us that the financial markets would regulate themselves. In return, what did we get? The financial crisis.

It's the Republican politicians who keep telling us that tax cuts pay for themselves and create jobs. In return, we have a huge deficit and an unacceptable unemployment rate. And it was Republicans who told us that we could fight two wars while giving more tax breaks to their rich friends.

Of course, Congresswoman WOOLSEY for years and years and years had reminded us that, first of all, the wars did not need to be fought, but, secondly, they were morally and fiscally wrong. In return, now we will end up paying a cost of nearly \$6 trillion by borrowing the money and adding this to the tally of our Nation's debt.

Now, unfortunately, Republicans are blaming their debts on the most vulnerable Americans. Even now they continue to drive our Nation closer and closer to the brink of disaster just to protect massive tax breaks for billionaires.

So once again, in closing, I am proud to stand here with Congresswoman WOOLSEY as a member of the triad. She is working to end our Nation's wars and will continue to do so to promote national security and to protect our seniors and our children, our working families and the most vulnerable Americans.

Thank you. We owe you, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, a debt of gratitude.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, on the floor today I think America and all of us in Congress are certainly concerned about the debt ceiling issue and what we are going to do and how we are going to be able to resolve it. But like many of my colleagues on the Democratic side, I am here today to talk about the war in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, I have beside me a really profound photograph of a wife in tears and a little girl sitting on her knee, who is too young to understand that her father, United States Army Sergeant Jeffrey Sherer, is laid under the flag that is now folded, being presented to the wife.

This is the pain of war, and I do say to Ms. WOOLSEY, thank you very much for what you have done to try to wake up the Congress and the American people.

Ten billion dollars a month going to Afghanistan. We can't even fix the bridges, we can't fix the roads, we are

cutting children's programs, we are cutting senior programs. And yet Mr. Karzai, who is known as a corrupt leader of Afghanistan, is going to get his \$10 billion a month while these programs that we are going to cut are going to be denied \$10 billion a month. It doesn't make any sense, Madam Speaker.

That brings me to an article written by A.C. Snow. He is well-known in North Carolina, where I am from, for his writings in *The News and Observer*, which is a State paper in Raleigh, North Carolina. This past July 4th, his article was titled "Time to Bring Them Home, Let Them Live."

"Time to Bring Them Home, Let Them Live."

Let this little girl's father live. Obviously, he will not live. He's dead. But how about the next little girl or little boy, or the wife and, in some cases, the husband?

Let me share with the House from A.C. Snow's writing, "Time to Bring Them Home, Let Them Live":

"It seems we never run out of wars. It is as if one small country after another sends out engraved invitations reading: 'We're having a war. Please come.' And Uncle Sam goes, lugging borrowed billions and thousands of young men and women to sacrifice on the altar of so-called freedom or 'nation building.'"

Snow closes his comments by quoting lyrics from "Les Miserables": "He is young. He is only a boy. You can take, you can give, Let him be, Let him live. Bring him home, Bring him home."

Snow further writes, "It's way past time to stop playing politics with the lives of America's youth. Bring them home. Let them live. Not just 30,000 of them. All of them."

Madam Speaker, I sit here day after day, in committees and on the floor of the House, listening to debate, sometimes being part of the debate. I just hope that the American people will understand that in this discussion at the White House with the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Senate, we could save \$100 billion. That's what it costs per year to be in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district. I have over 60,000 retired military. I listen to them. No, I did not serve, but I listen to those who are serving and those who did serve.

And like my colleagues, I go to Walter Reed, I go to Bethesda. I see the broken bodies, the amputated legs, the paralyzed; and I have written over 10,300 letters to families like Sergeant Sherer's to say to the families, I regret that I voted to send our kids into Iraq. It was a lie that got us there, and we never should have gone.

So I join my colleagues in both parties to do my part to say let's bring them home from Afghanistan. Let's bring them home before 2014 or 2015.

And, Madam Speaker, may God bless our men and women in uniform, and may God bless America.

FICTITIOUS DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my Republican colleague from North Carolina for that very powerful statement, and I am very glad that Congresswoman WOOLSEY was in the Chamber to hear that, Congresswoman WOOLSEY who has worked so hard to remind us of the terrible consequences of war.

I often sit here as we debate and seize from time to time at the statements of Republican colleagues, but that was profoundly moving, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I stand today, Madam Speaker, to talk on another issue that should unite our parties, and that is the fundamental question about whether or not the United States honors its commitments.

□ 1050

Today is July 12, exactly 3 weeks before August 2. August 2 is the date at which this government can no longer honor its commitments, at which time it will be forced to choose between paying those soldiers that we heard so movingly described and sending out Social Security checks, running a court system, paying Social Security and Medicare. Do we honor our commitments in the United States of America? I would think that both parties would say "yes" to that question. The Treasury Secretary, CEOs of American corporations and economist after economist have told us, Do not play around with the debt ceiling.

What is this debt ceiling, by the way, that is putting into peril the question of whether we honor our commitments? The debt ceiling is a pernicious fiction. It is a fiction that was put in place by this body decades ago to try to convince the American people that we could control our debts. And since then, it has never done that. It has been raised dozens of times as this body took the spending decisions and the tax cut decisions that required borrowing.

Under the Bush administration, the debt ceiling was raised seven times. Dozens and dozens of times, the debt ceiling has been raised. It is a fiction. It is a particularly pernicious set of smoke and mirrors that this institution uses to make people feel better while the debt rises, as it did under President Reagan, as it did under the first President Bush, as it did not under President Clinton, and as it did under President George W. Bush and President Obama.

So now the question is, do we honor the commitments made historically in this Chamber? We raise the debt ceiling not to spend more new money, to start new programs or to cut new taxes, but because we honor the commitments that were made in this Chamber to cut taxes in '01 and '03, to go to war twice in the last decade and

to add an expensive new drug benefit in Medicare.

Look, these are all things that people supported and opposed, but we committed to do them as a body. And you cannot make those decisions, you cannot vote to lower taxes or to increase spending and then turn around and say, I'm not going to pay for that. That is the worst sort of hypocrisy.

I'm glad that my friend from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY) talked about credit cards, but he got it a little bit wrong. The debt ceiling is sort of like a credit card, but what we're talking about right now, because we are talking about paying for past decisions and commitments, would be as if I went to the electronics store and I bought myself a big screen TV, I bought myself a new microwave, and I bought myself a new home security system, and then I get home and a month later I get the credit card bill and I say, uh, I don't know if I'm going to pay this credit card bill. I took the decisions. I made the commitments. And now the time has come to honor those commitments.

Do we act as stewards of one of the best assets that this country has, our full faith and credit, the belief that the United States honors its commitments? This is a critical asset, particularly now at a time of great economic uncertainty. Do we act as stewards of that full faith and credit? Or do we use the debt ceiling as a gun to the head to say that unless you do X, Y and Z, unless you cut 2 trillion or 3 trillion, we won't raise the debt ceiling, which is what we are hearing from the Republican side today? Do you use it? Do you hold it hostage, the full faith and credit of the United States? That is what we are seeing today.

Look, there is no question we need to address the deficit. We need to address the long-term sustainability of Medicare and Social Security in an equitable way. We should do that. And this President has basically put everything on the table, including making some of my colleagues on the Democratic side very uncomfortable with Social Security and Medicare. But he has put them on the table because there can be no sacred cows, unless you're JOHN BOEHNER, or a Republican, and not everything is on the table because we won't put the immense amount of spending we do through the Tax Code for advantages for oil companies, for advantages for big agriculture and for all sorts of tax breaks for corporations and others. We won't even talk about that.

My friends, this comes down to the question of do we honor our commitments? The answer to that question must be yes.

CONGRESSIONAL PENSION PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. This week, Madam Speaker, I will introduce a bill that

will amend the rules applicable to participation in the congressional pension plan. Under the present plan, upon completion of 5 years' service, a Member's pension vests. I believe a Member should make a more firm commitment than 5 years to become eligible to participate in the plan.

My bill, Madam Speaker, will increase the eligibility requirement from 5 years to 12 years. The bill, if enacted, will become effective at the convening of the 113th Congress. A Member could serve six 2-year House terms, two 6-year Senate terms or a combination thereof to become eligible to participate in the congressional pension plan.

If any colleagues are interested in my proposal, I will welcome cosponsors to the bill.

ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I am here to join with my colleagues in thanking the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for all that she has done to provide leadership on an issue that has been critical to the American people on an issue that she could very justifiably say, "I told you so."

Since I've been in this House, it's been my distinct privilege to consider her a friend and to enjoy the leadership and the insight that she has provided to many of us. Her position on Afghanistan is correct and a necessary position as we see these times before us. Americans who feel the sting of doing more with less are connecting the dots between Federal spending priorities and the pain that they're feeling at home right now.

Americans struggling to put their kids through college without any Pell Grants or running out of unemployment benefits with no new job on the horizon cannot ignore the cost of this war. The war has cost taxpayers in my congressional district more than \$580 million so far. That's about 11,000 elementary school teachers that could be hired for a year or 84,000 students that could go to community college or a university or a trade school or a career school.

These are just some of the bad trade-offs we are making by spending our national resources on a war instead of fixing the problems that we have here at home. Ask yourself, which would you rather have, a war that is not making us safer and not worth the cost, or a more educated, prosperous America?

We cannot afford the nearly \$10 billion per month while families struggle to stay afloat and the slow recovery of our Nation continues. Keeping America safe does not require 100,000 troops in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan but scattered across the world. It did not take 100,000 troops to find Osama bin Laden, and it does not

take a military occupation of Afghanistan to protect us from terrorist threats.

I am deeply proud of the hard work and incredible sacrifice of our brave men and women in uniform. We know they are carrying out the mission in Afghanistan with dedication and extraordinary competence. Through this nearly 10-year military campaign, they have done all that we have asked of them and represented our Nation's very best values and ideals. Now it's time to bring our troops home, and bring them home to a new reality. Since the year 2000, we have lost 2 million jobs in this country while we have added 30 million people to our population. After 10 years of a failed fiscal policy that brags about job creators through tax cuts, incentives and subsidies to corporations, this failed policy continues to be promoted as a solution to our economy and to the recession that we find ourselves in.

We need to bring our troops home. We need to integrate them fully back into our society and into our country. One of the best ways to do that is to provide jobs and opportunity. And one way is for the government to create jobs in public service and public works. By putting America back to work, we are beginning to crawl out of the hole that we have been in for the last 10 years.

Afghanistan is a stark example of flawed priorities. As we go forward with the discussion of the debt ceiling, with how to balance this budget and how to articulate priorities that the American people want, let us not forget that one of the priorities the American people have insisted on time and time again is to end these two misadventures in Iraq and Afghanistan, bring those troops home, redirect those resources to the needs that the American people face right now, and in this way, begin not only to make our economy better, but return some moral imperative to this Nation.

□ 1100

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. QUAYLE. Madam Speaker, last Friday's jobs report was incredibly disappointing. We only added 18,000 jobs to the U.S. economy. Our unemployment rate went up to 9.2 percent. Not to mention the fact that we had a downgrade, a revision, of last month's, of May's job report to only 25,000 jobs. The deeper you go into that jobs report, the worse it gets, because for those who are underemployed, that's about 16 percent to 17 percent of the United States population, and that is not even including the 250,000 people who went off the rolls of the unemployed because they just stopped looking for work.

We've been talking about jobs for a long time. You hear it all the time in

the halls of Congress. But what have we done? The House has passed a number of bills that would immediately open up a marketplace for job creation and job growth, but unfortunately our friends on the other side of the Capitol in the Senate have done nothing to advance these pieces of legislation. And it's not like they've had anything to do. I mean, they haven't even passed a budget in over 800 days. So I would ask our friends in the Senate to start to push these pro-growth economic policies so we can get Americans back to work.

But it's not just our friends on the other side of the Capitol who are holding us back. It's the administration who has pursued policies that have hurt job creation and economic growth. To be a good manager, to be a good executive, you have to be able to do two things well: One is to be able to analyze and pinpoint a problem, and the second part is to find a solution for that problem. Unfortunately, we have an administration that doesn't even do the first part well. They actually pinpoint problems that don't exist, or problems that aren't problems at all, so you can't even get to a solution that will get Americans back to work.

Let me give you a couple of examples of this. Recently, the President said that one of the problems we have with job creation is with ATMs and kiosks at our airports. I didn't know about the scourge of ATMs and kiosks, but apparently those are what are holding back our job creators. This is called innovation. This is called efficiency.

It reminds me of a story of when the famed economist Milton Friedman went to China. He was witnessing some excavation for a canal, and there were thousands of people who were digging with shovels. Milton Friedman asked: Why aren't you guys using bulldozers or excavators, those things that will make this more efficient?

The Chinese officials said: Then we couldn't put these people to work.

To that, Milton Friedman responded: Why don't you give them spoons?

Innovation and efficiency make our economy stronger, they're net job creators, so we should be going after what is really holding our country and is really holding back economic growth, and that is the NLRB who is attacking American companies who want to create American jobs. That is the EPA, who is going after numerous pieces of regulation that will in the near term kill jobs, in the medium term kill jobs, and in the long term kill jobs. We should be going after the FTC who is now going after Captain Crunch and Tony the Tiger. Those sorts of things are the ones that are holding our country back and holding back economic growth. We should be looking at those burdensome regulations and removing that and letting our entrepreneurs and our job creators unleash the ingenuity that they have within them.

There is one area of agreement that I do have with the President, and that is

with the free trade agreements. The free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama need to be passed through the House. But we've got to agree on something. They have been sitting on the President's desk since he has been in office. I urge the President to send those free trade agreements without any additional spending attached to them, because those are job creators. For every billion dollars worth of exports, it is 10,000 jobs here at home.

So I really hope the administration starts to pinpoint and look at the real problems that our country is facing so we can get America back to work and we can lead to more economic growth and prosperity, because it starts with the American worker.

DEBT CEILING NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I was just kind of curious about which one of those EPA regulations that my colleague was talking about. Perhaps it's the one that would prevent the emission of mercury into the air, or arsenic into the water. Maybe they want to poison the air and the water. Maybe that's what they're looking at. Or the SEC regulation that would bring to heel Wall Street and all of its excesses which just about terminated the economies of the world. Maybe those are the regulations they don't want to see. In any case, what I would really like to talk about here is the negotiations that are under way to deal with the looming crisis of the debt.

The President of the United States has said, okay, let's not kick the can down the road any further, let's deal with this issue, and has proposed a \$4 trillion solution. No sooner did he make that proposal than our Republican colleagues said, oh, no, we can't do that because that will include finally creating in America a fair Tax Code, one in which the superwealthy are actually going to get to pay for their share of the burden. For example, the hedge fund managers who pay a 15 percent rate on their earnings, their ordinary income, while the rest of us get to pay the full freight, whatever that might be, 35 percent for those at the top brackets. But, no, no, we can't deal with that problem, so we can't have a \$4 trillion solution.

The President also says, We're not going to kick the can down the road. We want to extend the debt limit to at least 2013, to put this issue off. But the Republicans don't want to do that. They want to do a short term.

I wonder what's going on here. Talking about cuts, the only cut that I've seen thus far defined by our Republican colleagues is to cut Medicare. In fact, not just cut it, terminate Medicare, to somehow take all of those Americans

who are 55 years or younger, and say to them, no, when you become 65, you will not have Medicare. We'll give you a voucher and you can go out and take your best shot with the private insurance sector.

Good luck. I was an insurance commissioner. I know what those private insurance companies will do. They'll deny you benefits, deny you coverage, and they will tell the doctor exactly what you might actually receive in terms of health care. It doesn't make much sense to me.

I think we need to support the President in this matter. I think we need a balanced approach here, one in which the wealthy finally get to pay their fair share, in which the oil companies no longer receive our hard-earned tax dollars so that they can have their \$4 billion subsidy. I think it's time, as we heard earlier from our colleagues, to end the wars. If we end the war in Afghanistan, we could over the next 4 or 5 years have a third of a trillion dollar reduction in our deficit.

There are many things that can be done, but one thing we will not do is to attack Social Security. Social Security and Medicare are the foundation of support for all Americans. When they become old, 65 and older, they know that they have that benefit available to them.

Medicare works. Medicare is actually far more efficient than any private health insurance system. It has provided seniors across this Nation with an opportunity to not be impoverished when they become 65, that their health care will be provided to them. It has allowed for the extension of their lives. It has reduced the poverty rate. Together with Social Security, these are two of the foundations that we have promised every American. When they become 65, they will not face poverty. They will have a foundation. Not enough to provide all that they might want but at least a foundation.

And so as we go through this whole issue of whether we're going to raise the debt limit or not, let us be mindful that we will not do it on the backs of the seniors, and we will do it in a balanced way as the President has said. We will provide for a fair Tax Code in which the superwealthy pay their fair share, in which corporations are no longer able to evade taxes, in which the oil companies no longer will receive our hard-earned tax dollars so that they can have even greater profits, and let us be mindful that the oil industry itself over the last 10 years, the top five oil companies have had over a trillion dollars of profits. It's time to bring back those subsidies and to balance our budget. We can do these things.

□ 1110

DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. SCHILLING. Madam Speaker, I come before the floor of the House this morning to talk about the top issue of the Illinois 17th Congressional District, and that is the debt limit. The debt limit has been raised 51 times since 1978. Mr. Geithner has indicated that doing the same thing over and over again is insanity, and I tend to agree with him.

Where are we at today? \$14.2 trillion in debt. We reached the debt limit on May 16, 2011. Business owners such as myself share a message with people: it is time that we did the responsible thing and come up with some solutions so we stop the continuance of leaving this debt to our kids and our grandkids.

As a small business owner, I'm asking President Obama not to balance the budget on the backs of the small businesses across the United States of America. The thing that I understand as a small business owner is that in a downturn economy, the worst thing we can do here from Washington, DC, is raise taxes on small businesses. The reason why, and I use my business as an example is, in a downturn economy, I understand that raising prices on my product when people are already struggling to purchase a product is not the best thing to do. When my taxes go up, I can raise the price or I can let someone go. And, you know, as hard as it is to let someone go, that's what businesses will have to do because people won't be able to afford their product.

We need to try a different way, and that's why we are promoting a new train of thought here in Washington, DC. These 87 Members of Congress have changed the thought process of Washington, DC. We've changed the thought process from how much can we spend to how much can we cut. What we have also done is, we are trying to get Washington, DC, to focus in on wants versus needs and then prioritizing those out.

The President has even admitted that the overregulation needs to be addressed. Whether it is the EPA, OSHA, the overtaxing, the 1099 tax form that we just got repealed, the Small Business Administration says that businesses like my little pizzeria in Moline spend four-and-a-half times as much per employee to comply with environmental regulations than bigger companies. We spend three times more per employee on tax compliance than large businesses.

Congress needs to provide an environment with some economic certainties. We can do this by stopping tax increases on our job creators. My home State of Illinois, and quite frankly President Obama's State of Illinois, recently had the largest tax increase in the history of the State. It seems like every morning you open up the paper in Illinois and another business is threatening to leave. We can do something about this. We can provide our job creators with a certainty that with the unemployment rate at 9.2 percent, we don't need to add any more tax bur-

den or further any more overregulation.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I too want to acknowledge my good friend, LYNN WOOLSEY, for 20 really illustrious years in the Congress. I cannot imagine why she would want to end her illustrious career here so early. We will miss her.

I should warn Members of Congress that a peculiar part of the Financial Services appropriations, which comes to the floor this week, will seem particularly strange, even inappropriate. It is a historical anachronism, and I can only apologize for it. We must quickly make sure that we enter the 21st century on the District of Columbia local budget. Yes, it is our budget. We raise it all in the District of Columbia. We are American citizens.

Some have said, But the District of Columbia is mentioned and comes under the Constitution. So be it. I'm a constitutional lawyer; I concede that. But in their wisdom, after 150 years of shame, the Congress of the United States decided to grant home rule, as we call it, to the District of Columbia. So that instead of having a city of hundreds of thousands of Americans run by a Federal body, the Congress said that we delegate, we use our power under the Constitution to delegate to the District of Columbia the ability to elect its local officials, and raise its own money—we were raising our own budget all along. And spend its own money. For the most part Congress has adhered to this delegation by law. After all, we raise \$4 billion. That's more than some States.

It is, of course, the very essence of the principle of federalism embraced by both sides of the aisle of this body. Our federalism is what has held the Union together. We are a very different jurisdiction, so we have acknowledged different strokes for different folks. As if to reinforce that principle, a new crop of Republicans has come with federalism as a virtual original principle, giving new meaning to the notion of local control. Indeed, these new Republicans want the Federal Government out of even many Federal matters and to them turned back to the States. And so I imagine that the whole notion of the big foot of the Federal Government on the District of Columbia in local matters would particularly offend the new so-called "tea party" Republicans if they are adhering to their own principles.

The appropriation that will come before this body already intrudes on the District of Columbia with one rider, a rider involving abortion services for local women. That's embedded in it. If this Congress holds to principle, there certainly will be no more.

The world saw the reaction the last time the Congress tried to add attachments to the District of Columbia appropriation. It was in the budget deal of 2011. At a time when people in the Mideast were in the streets against their government, it was our government that went into the streets, and you saw elected officials from the top of the government, both the executive and the legislature, arrested in acts of civil disobedience because of intrusion on the way that the citizens of the District of Columbia spend their own local money. And the White House was not exempt. Residents also went to the White House and some were arrested right there because the White House agreed to the 2011 budget deal at the very last minute.

Now a new national organization composed of national organizations that themselves have millions of members across the United States have come forward to help us, and they have sent letters to Members of Congress saying that you will not be able to anonymously any more engage in intrusion on the local affairs of a local jurisdiction. We are activating our members to let them know if you intrude by voting for any attachment that takes away the ability of the District of Columbia to spend its own local funds as it sees fit. Local taxes, my friends, local issues. Not your business unless you raise the money.

Some of these issues are controversial. That also is the essence of federalism. We, of course, bow to the differences among us instead of trying to take away our rights to embrace those differences. Much that occurs in your district is enough to raise the hairs of my own citizens. We would not want to deprive you of your rights. We ask that you do not deprive us of ours. There will be consequences.

DEBT CEILING NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the ongoing debt ceiling negotiations, or so they're called. The debt crisis currently facing our country is a grave one. Make no mistake, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has called the debt the greatest threat to our national security. Not Iraq, not Afghanistan, not al Qaeda, but our debt.

Since January 2009, \$3.7 trillion has been added to the national debt. Currently, our debt stands at \$14.3 trillion, and I'm told if you add in the cost, the present day cost of all of the promises that irresponsible people who have stood here before me have made to the American people, that the cost would be over \$70 trillion.

□ 1120

Many Americans, including this one, can't even conceptualize that, can't count that high. And that's not their

fault; that's this body's fault. There is a lot of fearmongering going on by people who want us to spend more. They have seen these tactics work in the past—bank bailouts, massive spending bills.

Even if the calamity forecast were to come to pass, it doesn't change the fact that the debt crisis we face is our fiscal sin. Our generation and generations before ours are responsible for it; not my kids, not your kids, and not our grandchildren. If addressing it hurts in the short term, then I say so be it.

I reject the idea that we would pass this mess on to our kids for some short-term economic or political gain. That is one of the most piggish ideas I've ever heard, and it runs counter to the spirit that helped make this Nation great, an exceptional Nation. We own this mess. If we have to suffer a little bit in the short term to right our fiscal house in the long term, that's our duty, and it's our duty to fix it. It is debt that is hurting the economy and, don't forget, the misguided, big-government economic ideas that have been implemented over the last 2½ years.

These debt ceiling negotiations are a great opportunity to enact monumental reform within the Federal Government, making the future brighter for all Americans, so the next 2 weeks, my colleagues, are critical. We can do it, if we want to, in a bipartisan fashion. We must seize the opportunity. It is more important that we craft a deal that gets it right for the sake of our children and grandchildren than we implement a false fix driven by short-term thinking. Getting it right means enacting permanent and structural reforms to the way Washington spends. Raising taxes is not necessary and would only hurt the economy. Our government doesn't tax too little. Our government spends too much.

By "permanent and structural," I mean a balanced budget amendment. A balanced budget amendment would be hard for a future Congress or a future President to change, and it would force the necessary things that cause us to live within our means again. In order to raise the debt ceiling, the price for that concession must be the passage of permanent and structural reforms like the balanced budget amendment—period. There is no additional negotiation. There is no additional request. The request is to raise the debt ceiling \$2 trillion. Okay. Let's do it, but if we do it, let's make sure it never has to be done again. The only way to do that is through permanent and structural reforms like a balanced budget amendment. If the consequences of not raising the debt ceiling are as severe as some suggest, surely we can find the common ground necessary for a deal that forces our government to balance its budget like American families do every month.

I'm excited. Rarely does a legislative body have a chance to do something so monumental and so monumentally great. This would be among the most

significant reforms in our Nation's history. I don't know that an opportunity to enact a balanced budget amendment will be within our reach again for a very long time.

I do know I've only been around for 6 months on this floor, and no matter how long I or others stay, I think we will look back on the next 3 weeks as one of the best opportunities we will have ever had for making things better for our future, for our posterity. That ultimately is how we should look at every vote we take on this floor, not how it will benefit us in the here and now, but how it will benefit our children's chances to inherit what we did—the greatest, most exceptional Nation the world has ever known. I didn't come here to vote for us in the here and now. I came here to vote for our future.

Now is the time for bold, decisive action. Now is the time for a balanced budget amendment. Nothing short of the future of our children and grandchildren is at stake.

AMERICA NEEDS TO ADDRESS CAUSES, NOT EFFECTS, OF AMERICA'S ECONOMIC PREDICAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, America's so-called "spending problem" directly relates to unemployment. Revenues just aren't growing fast enough because of unemployment. Yet Washington, D.C., is tied in knots over raising the debt limit and over how much more America has to borrow because our economy isn't growing fast enough to put millions of Americans back to work.

But you can't balance a budget unless people are working, because unemployment equals a loss of revenues with rising deficits. People know this. When they're out of work, they have deficits in their own family budgets, and they have to cut back. Our local school systems have to cut back because we know revenues aren't there, and certainly our Nation has to cut back when the revenues aren't coming in. Yet many inside Washington, D.C., have their eyes on the effect, not on the cause, of our predicament.

The principal cause of deficits is unemployment. Triggered by what? Triggered first by Wall Street corruption and greed. As well, deficits are triggered by growing trade deficits, which I will talk about in a second, due to the outsourcing of U.S. jobs, and rising deficits are due to endless wars.

America needs to address these causes, but Washington is addressing only effects. Again today, we have news that one of the principal causes of chronic unemployment and deficits is headed in the wrong direction. The United States trade deficit, our balance of goods and services accounts with other countries, is seriously hem-

orrhaging. In May, the U.S. trade deficit grew again—more in the red—by over \$50.2 billion. More lost jobs. Yes, the imports of higher priced oil keep pushing all of America deeper into the red. People know it because they're paying over \$4 a gallon when they fill up their cars with gas. I did that last night again.

America has a jobs problem, and that triggers the red ink. America has a jobs problem. That triggers the red ink. Wake up, Washington. America has a jobs problem.

In 1993, some Members here in Congress argued, Oh, pass NAFTA, over my strong objections, because it's going to create millions of jobs, and we will have this terrific trade balance with Mexico and Canada. Exactly the reverse happened. We have over \$1 trillion of trade deficit post-NAFTA, and there hasn't been a single year in which it has been balanced. Millions of U.S. jobs have been lost. And each year more red ink due to NAFTA stacks up—over a trillion dollars and counting.

Then in the late 1990s, the same Members said, Oh, let's sign the same kind of deal with China, and we did, over my strong objections again. Guess what happened? Millions more lost jobs in this country. In fact, the Manufacturing Policy Project estimates that there have been over 14 million jobs lost just in terms of NAFTA and PNTR.

We can no longer afford to add hundreds of billions of dollars annually to our trade deficit, because it throttles economic growth. It literally crushes it. It creates more unemployment in this country. Today, we are facing unsustainable levels of unemployment for the third year since the recklessness of Wall Street brought the economy crushing down after gas prices went up to over \$4 a gallon in 2007. The official unemployment rates today are over 9 percent, and this causes red ink at every level; but rather than focusing on job creation, Washington wants to give us more of these trade agreements, this time they say with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, using the same failed trade model that has resulted in huge trade deficits and more lost jobs.

Congress needs to address causes. We need to get our deficits under control by balancing our trade accounts and stopping job outsourcing. We need to get our deficits under control by putting people back to work. We need to get our deficits under control by ending endless wars, and we need to balance our accounts by making sure that Wall Street and the greedy who are getting a free ride pay their fair share.

America needs a results-oriented trade policy that creates jobs here in our country, with more exports going out than imports coming in, and a trade policy that holds our trade partners accountable. We don't need more NAFTA trade model-type agreements, which is what they're going to try to

push through again. Madam Speaker, America's deficit problem relates directly to a lack of jobs—to vast pools of unemployed people, to Americans who want to work but who are losing hope. Unemployment translates into red ink and a lack of revenue. Until this Congress addresses unemployment, it won't solve the deficit problem.

America needs to address the causes, not the effects of America's economic predicament. When will this Congress address those causes?

THE OATH TO DEFEND THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues why we are here.

We are here to represent our constituents, and we are bound by an oath that we all took when we were sworn into office.

As each of us stood in this Chamber, we solemnly swore that we would support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that we would bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that we would take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that we would well and faithfully discharge the duties of this office in which we serve, so help us God.

□ 1130

Madam Speaker, there is a constituent of mine, Jack Smith. He is a defender of the Constitution and one of the strongest conservatives I know. Jack never fails to sound the alarm when Washington is off track when it comes to the Constitution—and I think we all know that comes quite often; it is very frequent.

So whether it's a foreign or domestic enemy of the Constitution, I stand committed to defend this document whenever and wherever I can. And today, in honor of Jack and the Ninth Congressional District, Liberty Council, and all my constituents, I urge the Members of this House, the Senate, and the Office of the President to reflect on your oath, to reflect on what you swore as you took that oath of office and the clear guidelines that it and the Constitution have bound us by, because the future of this great and glorious cause we call America depends on it.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, for a number of months now I have come to this floor to tell the stories of men and women in the military who have been raped by other soldiers. As heinous as those assaults are, the greatest injus-

tice is suffered after the assault when victims are doubted, debased, disrespected, and discharged from the military that they have so proudly enlisted in.

Last night, I had a long conversation with an Army and Navy veteran, Terri Odom, who told me she dreamed to serve in the military since she was a little girl. She was so determined that between her junior and senior summer she went to boot camp—not to some playground area somewhere in her community, but to boot camp. After high school, she went to Sicily with the Seabees. She told me that she had never been happier, serving her country, seeing the world, even swimming in the Mediterranean. It was like Terri was living a military recruiting commercial.

While there, she was befriended by an NCO 25 years her senior. He was a father figure to Terri, and she trusted him explicitly. When he volunteered to walk her home one night, Terri accepted the offer without hesitation. She told me that when he first grabbed her, she was more confused than scared. This is a young woman who was very proud of her service and had the utmost respect for her colleagues, particularly one who had such a distinguished career. This couldn't possibly be happening.

Terri's story is graphic. I only tell you the details so you can understand how horrific the response has been from our military.

Terri was raped repeatedly. Her abuser used pipes and other objects he found in her bathroom that was being remodeled. He cut her arms and vagina, then poured paint thinner into her wounds. He punched her with the full force of his 6-foot-4-inch, 270-pound frame. Terri, it should be noted, is 5 foot 3 inches. She fought back, even did some damage, but she was outmatched.

She woke up in a bathtub covered in blood. She was missing teeth and fingernails, yet her first thought was that she couldn't be late for duty. She also knew that she could get medical attention and file a criminal complaint at the base. Surely, the Navy would take care of her. It turns out she was wrong about that, as she was about her rapist.

Terri cleaned herself up, showered, showed up for duty, and reported the rape to her chain of command. She requested medical attention, but was told instead to take an aspirin and sleep it off. No one in Terri's chain of command allowed her to get medical attention. Instead, they told her to drop the rape story or her career would be over. Despite valiant efforts to stop it, Terri was eventually honorably discharged against her will, which is exactly what happens to 90 percent of military personnel who report rapes.

The Navy lost a good soldier that day. The Navy also kept a rapist—not officially, of course, because there was never an investigation. The reason? Because in the military, the authority to request one lies with the chain of com-

mand; but the chain of command is incentivized not to, because they are judged on how few instances of rape and other mishaps occur during their command. This is as true today as it was when Terri served. That is why Terri Odom has once again answered the call to service. She is here with me this morning to make sure her story is heard.

This Nation must aggressively pursue rape charges in our military. Sexual assault cases must be taken out of the chain of command and must never be punished by nonjudicial remedies like a mere demotion in rank. Finally, a uniform is not a get-out-of-jail-free card. Military sex offenders must be entered into the same national database as those in the civilian world.

Two decades ago, a young woman served proudly in the United States Navy and knew she was making the world a better place; then, a criminal and a criminally negligent system conspired to take it all away from her. But that young woman is back and she is not alone. Women and men from every branch of the military are speaking up. This is a problem we can fix. We only have to want to.

NO RAISING TAXES

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I have listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talking about the need for us to get our economic house in order.

The President down at the White House is saying that we have to raise taxes because we have a revenue problem and we need to bring in more money. The fact of the matter is that this last year we had a 7 percent increase in taxes coming in. We had a 7 percent increase in taxes coming in even though we have the unemployment problems that we have. The problem was we spent 11 percent more than we took in.

So the problem we have right now is that the White House is spending too much money. We have to cut spending. We're bringing in more money than we did last year, last fiscal year, but we're spending way more than that. So we have a spending problem, not a taxing problem.

Now, they also said that we ought to tax the rich more. The fact is that the top 20 percent of wage earners in this country pay over 85 percent of the taxes. Now, if they raise that tax up, you're taking more money out of the people's pockets who can invest in companies, in business and industry that will create jobs and products that we can export around the world.

I don't understand why we can't get that point across very clearly to the American people. If we want to cure the unemployment problem, which is now 9.2 percent, what we have to do is get the private sector in a position

where they can create more jobs. That means we need to lower taxes, not raise them, like Ronald Reagan did. We need to cut government regulations, so that the private sector won't be strangled by the regulations in this country, and then let the free enterprise system work. If we do that, unemployment will go down; there will be more people working. Therefore, there will be more taxpayers paying into the treasury. Therefore, the deficit will go down and we won't have the economic problems we have today.

But raising taxes right now on any part of our society will only exacerbate the problem. And if the President has his way and we end up raising taxes—and I'm not going to vote for it—then what's going to happen is we're going to see unemployment get worse and worse and worse.

We've got to do what's economically correct, fiscally responsible, and that is to cut spending and to not raise taxes, especially in this climate. And if we do that and free up the free enterprise system, this country will get back on track very quickly.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask today that You bless the Members of this assembly to be the best and most faithful servants of the people they serve. Purify their intentions, that they will say what they believe and act consistent with their words.

May they be filled with gratitude at the opportunity they have to serve in this place. We thank You for the abilities they have been given to do their work, to contribute to the common good. May they use their talents as good stewards of Your many gifts and thereby be true servants of justice and partners in peace.

We thank You as well for this marvelous forum, where the important business of this Nation has been done in the past and is done today. May the work being done now be guided by Your Spirit.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OFFICER BRYAN HEBERT, TEXAS LAWMAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend John Wesley Nero got into an argument with his mother and his grandmother. So, being a scoundrel, he beat them both up and then fled into the darkness of the night.

Local Beaumont, Texas, police officers confronted the outlaw to talk to him, but he fled away in his truck, and a high-speed chase occurred.

Meanwhile Officer Bryan Hebert—right here is a photograph of him—had positioned his vehicle ahead of the chase. He attempted to retrieve road spikes out of the trunk to stop Nero's vehicle. According to witnesses, when Nero spotted Hebert's car, Nero intentionally crashed into Hebert's patrol car, shoving the vehicle over Officer Hebert and killing him.

Officer Bryan Hebert, 36, was a 10-year veteran of the Beaumont, Texas, Police Department. John Wesley Nero is charged with capital murder.

Officer Hebert and police officers like him protect the rest of us from killers like Nero. They are the wall between the law and the lawless, the barrier between us and evildoers.

So today the badges of peace officers in southeast Texas are covered with the black cloth of sacrifice in honor of Officer Hebert, a lawman who sacrificed life to uphold the law.

And that's just the way it is.

PROTECTING SENIOR CITIZENS FROM THE RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Social Security didn't create the deficit, but America's

seniors are being presented with a fake Social Security crisis to try to trick them into accepting reduced benefits.

Social Security will be able to pay 100 percent of its benefits through 2037 without any changes whatsoever. So why the panic today? If seniors accept cuts in Social Security benefits today, a surplus cash flow will build in the Social Security Trust Fund. According to CRS, "Social Security's cash surpluses are borrowed by the U.S. Treasury and can be used for tax cuts, spending, or repaying debt."

So here's what's going on: Social Security benefit cuts or an increase in taxes paid to Social Security or extending the retirement age will give the government more money for tax cut spending or repaying the debt, except for one thing: Social Security money belongs to those who have paid into the fund. It's not the government's money to use, and it shouldn't be the government's money to play with.

Senior citizens should not have to accept a reduced standard of living to finance tax cuts for the rich.

We must take a stand for senior citizens and protect Social Security and protect future generations from this raid on Social Security funds.

SUPPORTING INVESTMENT IN OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE AND LEVEE SYSTEM

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of funding for the Army Corps of Engineers directed toward improving infrastructure and the damaged levee system that needs critical restoration after this historic season of flooding.

The unprecedented flooding along the Lower Mississippi River Valley area touched every part of the First District of Arkansas, my home district, and profoundly impacted our way of life. Homes and property were damaged, businesses were closed, and a vast amount of cropland was under water shortly after planting season had begun.

Preliminary estimates of crop damage across Arkansas has surpassed half a billion dollars, a huge toll on my district's agriculture-based economy. Farming is our way of life, and this bill provides farmers with the assurance necessary to reinvest in future production. Much of America's commodities are produced along the Mississippi Delta, and we must take the necessary steps to ensure our safe and reliable food supply is protected.

This vital investment in our Nation's infrastructure and levee system will provide security not only to our farmers but the families who live and work there as well as our consumers all across the country.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD EARL
ROBERTS, SR.

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

Ms. BASS of California. Madam Speaker, I come to the House floor today to pay tribute to a man of exceptional valor, a quiet hero, a committed family man, a successful entrepreneur, and my constituent: Leonard Earl Roberts, Sr.

Mr. Roberts lived an extraordinary life. At the age of 16, he joined the Civilian Conservation Corps and later voluntarily enlisted in the U.S. Army after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Platoon Sergeant Roberts led a special unit ashore on D-day. He and his entire squadron received the Bronze Indian Arrowhead for Assault Troopers, and he received the Purple Heart.

After he was honorably discharged at the close of the war, Mr. Roberts returned home to claim the hand of his childhood sweetheart, Dessie, and then used the GI Bill to attend the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Mr. Roberts used his MIT engineering degree to invent a machine that would revolutionize the aerospace industry. And in 1972 in Torrance, California, with his wife and family by his side, Leonard Sr. established Roberts Aerospace Manufacturing Engineering Corporation, one of today's leading companies in the industry.

Leonard Earl Roberts, Sr. was a great American born of a great generation. He was a man of service, honor, integrity, faith, and family. He lived an inspirational life, and our Nation will forever be enriched because of him.

□ 1210

JOBS AND JOB CREATION

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

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of jobs and job creation in our country. For 29 consecutive months we have seen unemployment exceed 8 percent. Back in June, we announced 18,000 jobs were created in this country. That's less than 300 jobs per State, for a now 9.2 percent unemployment rate.

In response to this, in New Hampshire I have established a getting Granite Staters back to work initiative, where I have hosted two job fairs. Over 400 people have attended, where one gentleman had said to me he was out of work for 3 years. Back here in Washington, people like that gentleman need us to pass a balanced budget, reduce our spending, reduce our debt and deficit, and get serious about creating an environment where small business can once again succeed in our country.

I have and hope that the Senate and the administration will join the House in this effort.

TAXING OUR SENIORS

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I respectfully suggest a small correction to the Republicans' statement that their position on the deficit negotiations is no new taxes. It would be far more accurate for them to state their position is no new taxes except for seniors, because sharp increases to participate in the costs of Medicare and Medicaid or decreases in the benefits of Social Security would act just like a tax on income targeted right at the elderly.

The Republican proposal for Medicare would hit retired seniors immediately by reopening the doughnut hole. And according to a report from the Joint Economic Committee, for my home State of New York it would cost future retirees an additional \$6,500 out of pocket. You can call that some sort of adjustment if you like, but I call it a tax, and I call it wrong. Grover Norquist agrees. He says changes to the CPI is a stealth tax increase: wrong for our seniors, wrong for the economy, and wrong for the country.

PRESIDENT OBAMA, JOIN US IN
SUPPORTING POLICIES THAT
WILL PUT AMERICANS BACK TO
WORK

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, 9.2 percent unemployment in June. Twenty-nine months in a row of over 8 percent unemployment. Twenty million Americans remain unemployed or underemployed. It has to stop. These are stark reminders that President Obama's excessive spending, unprecedented debt, and overregulation, as well as the threats of job-killing taxes on small businesses and entrepreneurs, are holding back private sector job creation in our economy.

American job creators fear the regulatory and fiscal environment they will face in the near future. Until they have some certainty, they will not invest or hire. We are working hard to bring back that certainty and ensure our pro-growth economic environment. By doing that, we must cut red tape, cut spending, and keep taxes low, but also pass legislation to expand domestic energy production and open new markets for American goods overseas.

We need President Obama and his party to stop trying to raise taxes on job creators and instead embrace our commonsense proposal to put Americans back to work.

WE NEED A BIPARTISAN DEBT
LIMIT AGREEMENT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, as Secretary Geithner has observed, failure to raise the debt ceiling would have catastrophic economic consequences that would last for decades. This view was shared by former Treasury Secretary Paulson, who says that inaction is simply not an option. I agree, and believe that raising the debt ceiling must be accompanied by deficit reduction, mostly by cutting spending, but also by eliminating some unnecessary tax breaks.

Now, there are those who say that there are no unnecessary tax breaks. Let me just give you one. If your neighbor buys a car and pays interest on the loan to buy that car, that interest is not tax-deductible. If your other neighbor buys a yacht and pays interest on the loan to buy that yacht, that interest is tax-deductible.

When we are borrowing 40 cents for every dollar, we have to ask ourselves if those tax breaks are really worth it. If we are starting from scratch, would we really give yacht owners an extra tax break?

BETTY FORD MEMORIAL

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

Mr. AMASH. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that west Michigan learned on Friday of the passing of our First Lady, Betty Ford.

The First Lady spent most of her life in Grand Rapids. A graduate of Central High School, she worked in a department store downtown and was a dance instructor. Early on, Mrs. Ford showed her heart for the disadvantaged in our community, teaching dance to children who were physically disabled, deaf, and blind.

A mutual friend introduced Mrs. Ford to Jerry in 1947. A successful lawyer and former star of the University of Michigan's football team, the future President was not quite in public life when they met. No one could have foreseen the set of circumstances that thrust the Fords into the White House, but Mrs. Ford took the challenge with gusto.

As First Lady, she revealed many of her struggles to the public so that she could help others with similar difficulties. In the 1970s, she publicly spoke about her battle with breast cancer, which was not often discussed during that time. In the 1980s, she took the lessons she learned battling alcoholism to found a number of foundations and institutes dedicated to helping others with the condition.

Betty Ford honored west Michigan with her public service, humor, and grace. We are proud to have called such a fine citizen one of our own.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, in 1983 President Ronald Reagan said the following: “The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The risks, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: the Senate must pass this legislation before the Congress adjourns.”

Thank goodness Congress had the good sense to listen and pass a higher debt limit with no conditions at a time, by the way, when Medicare solvency was far worse than it is today, and then did it 16 more times during the Reagan Presidency.

Today, we have the head of the national Republican Party, Reince Priebus, saying yesterday, don’t worry, the government will find some other way to pay its bills. That is dangerous nonsense. It is time for the Republican Party to stop playing Russian roulette with the American economy and American families. Let’s pass a clean debt limit and move on to growing the U.S. economy and creating jobs.

CONGRATULATING THE U.S. WOMEN’S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, like millions of other Americans, I was watching the women’s soccer team play in Germany. What a wonderful moment it was when they came back at the last second and grabbed victory from defeat. Abby Wambach’s tremendous header, the save by Hope Solo, and the five kicks by the American women made us all proud to be Americans. The American soccer team won, and they are going to play again tomorrow, and we need to cheer for them.

Abby Wambach, when asked about her kick, said it was something about being an American. We don’t give up. We know we can win, and we don’t give up, and we win. I would ask my Republican colleagues to remember Abby Wambach and not give up and win on the deficit, because otherwise we will be losers in the eyes of the world on our economics and our ability to finance our own debt. Go United States of America.

FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. PENCE. Well, negotiations over the Nation’s debt ceiling have reached an impasse. After more than 2 years in office, trillions of dollars in borrowing

and spending and bailouts and takeovers, the President now says the failure to reach an agreement is because of Republicans in the Congress, Republicans who were in the minority in the last Congress in fact; the President says because Republicans in Washington haven’t “fully realized that the philosophy of politics does not work in governing.” He is telling us to eat our peas.

Okay. Well, the President basically is saying that Congress owns the problem. But that’s not what he said 5 years ago. Explaining his opposition to raising the debt ceiling, then-Senator Barack Obama said, “The fact we are here today raising America’s debt limit is a sign of leadership failure.” He said that doing so weakens us domestically. He said, “Leadership means the buck stops here. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership.” He said Americans deserve better. Well, I say Senator Obama, you were right.

When the U.S. Government can’t pay its bills, it’s not only a debt problem, but it is a failure of leadership at the Presidential level, just as you said. The truth is it’s the President’s problem. If President Obama wants to raise the debt ceiling, he should recognize it’s his responsibility, it’s his problem, and come to the Congress and ask us to step forward and help him solve that problem by cutting spending now, capping spending, and sending a balanced budget amendment to the States.

□ 1220

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, we can all agree that we need to bring down our deficit, but we disagree on how to do it.

Republicans in Congress say that the only way to do this is to gut the services that American families rely on. Their priority is to protect the wealthiest among us who continue to enjoy loopholes and tax breaks. They should be paying their fair share.

Social Security is a promise to every American worker for years of hard work and provides dignity in retirement and help to support surviving children. Today nearly 55 million Americans rely on Social Security, including 214,000 in Hawaii. The program is vital to women, particularly single women, who disproportionately face poverty in old age.

The American middle class and our seniors deserve a fair solution on the deficit that gets our economy back on track and creates jobs—but not, not on the backs of our families and seniors.

PUTTING OUR COUNTRY AT RISK

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, the ongoing stubbornness by my Republican colleagues to even entertain the idea of increasing revenues is putting our country at risk.

Over the past decade, the top 2 percent of Americans making over \$250,000 have done incredibly well. And while I have enjoyed reduced taxes as a result of the Bush-era tax cuts, our seniors, our workers don’t even come close. They have lost pensions, 401(k) plans, home values, and all that’s left is Social Security and Medicare. As you can see here, these tax cuts are the primary contributor to our debt and deficit over the long term.

Madam Speaker, default on America’s debt would be catastrophic to both our economy and the world. It’s time for my Republican colleagues to get serious. Stop playing with fire and put the future of the Nation first ahead of millionaires, corporations that avoid taxes and benefit from loopholes in the law, and ahead of those who would ship jobs overseas.

So, no, seniors and those with disabilities didn’t cause this deficit, as we can see, and the long-term debt, and they shouldn’t have to cut their benefits to pay for it.

JOBS, OFFSHORING PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, last week’s jobs report showing an unemployment rate going in the wrong direction from 9.1 percent to 9.2 percent underscores the urgent need to focus on policies in this House that help create jobs and grow the economy.

Part of that agenda should be the passage of the Offshoring Prevention Act of 2011, which I introduced last week. At a time when we should be working to restore our manufacturing sector, we are undermining it because our Tax Code actually rewards companies that send manufacturing jobs overseas.

The Offshoring Prevention Act will close the tax loophole that allows this to happen. It has been 27 weeks since the majority party took control of this House, and they have done nothing to create jobs. They haven’t even brought a single jobs bill to the House floor.

While they have been stalling on the most important priority for our country, Democrats have put forth our jobs agenda, the Make It in America agenda, which will help rebuild our manufacturing base, invest in policies that keep good-paying jobs here in America, and allow us to compete in the global economy.

Madam Speaker, this is the kind of legislation we should be pursuing here in this House. Sensible legislation that helps our recovering economy, helps us compete in the global marketplace, and puts Americans back to work.

HONORING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT SERGEANT FIRST CLASS LEROY PETRY

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery and valor of Sergeant First Class Leroy Petry of Santa Fe, who will be awarded the Medal of Honor today by President Obama.

As the second living, active duty Medal of Honor recipient for actions in Iraq or Afghanistan, Sergeant Petry's heroism and sacrifice in the face of extreme danger went above and beyond the call of duty.

As an Army Ranger serving in Afghanistan, Sergeant Petry acted without regard for his own personal safety, thinking only of his fellow soldiers when he threw a grenade away from his squad. His selfless actions cost him his right hand yet saved the lives of his brothers in arms.

New Mexico has a long tradition of serving our country during times of war. In World War II, Navajo code talkers contributed to the victory of our Allied Forces. Seventy-one daughters and sons of New Mexico have made the ultimate sacrifice in service during the Afghanistan and Iraq wars.

Now, with his courageous actions in the face of great danger, Sergeant Petry takes his place among his fellow New Mexicans as a true American hero.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, President Reagan is an iconic figure in the Republican Party and revered by many Democrats. He did fight to shrink government and he lowered taxes, but he also raised taxes eight times and he also fought against the absurd notion that America had an option when it came to paying our bills. When the debt ceiling had to be raised, he did it because he knew that was essential, that was our responsibility.

We have got an argument on the other side today that paying our bills is optional. That is dangerous; that is absurd.

There are two arguments the other side is making: One, that it's Obama's problem, despite the fact that they insisted on the Iraq war, the Afghanistan war, going into nation building, tax cuts that we can't afford, Medicare prescription part D. But, second—this is what's really not on the level—every single person who voted for the Ryan budget voted for a budget that will raise the debt from \$14.3 trillion to \$23 trillion. And after voting for that budget, now we will vote against raising the debt ceiling that is required to implement the budget that you voted for.

DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, as negotiations continue on the upcoming debt ceiling, the retirement savings, mortgages, and pensions of the American people hang in the balance.

It is long past time for both sides—I say, for both sides—to get serious about a balanced budget. Any long-term budget must—I state, must—protect Medicare and Social Security for all Americans, create jobs here at home, and begin to reduce the deficit with intelligent class protection.

It's time for the wealthiest among us to step up to the plate and take up their share. We must end tax breaks for ultrarich, Big Oil companies, and the corporations that ship jobs overseas.

No jobs have been created—I state, no jobs have been created—in the United States since the Bush tax cuts first went into effect. No taxes, no jobs. No taxes, no jobs.

Let us put politics aside and do what is best for the interests of the American people before it is too late.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, this image depicts a watershed moment for our Nation's senior citizens. President Harry Truman conceived of Medicare during his Presidency and received first Medicare card after President Johnson signed the program into law 46 years ago, when 40 percent of Americans over the age of 65 lived at or below the poverty level, largely due to medical costs. Now only 10 percent live in poverty.

But my Republican colleagues seek to radically alter this successful program. Their plan would double annual out-of-pocket expenses from \$6,000 to \$12,000, would give insurance companies the power to ration care, and would force seniors to spend another \$2.2 billion on prescription drugs by reopening the doughnut hole.

Madam Speaker, balancing the budget is a national priority. Everyone needs to work together, and everyone has to sacrifice to get our fiscal house in order.

But my Republican colleagues continue to argue for special interest exceptions from that national sacrifice. They are letting oil companies and companies sending jobs overseas off the hook. Why should profitable companies continue receiving taxpayer subsidies while we're asking Grandma to pay more?

Madam Speaker, as Medicare turns 46, let's get serious. Let's be sure that this is a national priority and a national sacrifice.

□ 1230

REPUBLICANS' RECKLESS BEHAVIOR

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, we have a lot of Americans who engage in very reckless behavior; but generally, that reckless behavior only affects them or maybe their friends or neighbors.

The Republican majority in this Congress is reckless enough that they want to endanger 310 million Americans; reckless enough that they will refuse to pay our debts no matter what kind of a deal is worked out; reckless enough to make us default on the full faith and credit of the United States; reckless enough to raise interest rates on not only our debt, thereby making the deficit worse, but on every American who has a credit card or an adjustable rate mortgage or is borrowing any money; and reckless enough, according to a bipartisan panel that came to this body last week, to take away 10 percent of GDP, costing this country hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of jobs in the month of August alone.

We have a responsibility to the American people to perform for the interests of their lives and this country. And reckless behavior—refusing to raise the debt limit of the United States is about as reckless as you can get. We need to act responsibly.

WE WILL NOT SACRIFICE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, let me draw your attention to this important chart drafted by the Congressional Budget Office. It shows what the drivers of our debt are.

Now, there's something on here that you see and there's something on here that you won't see. You will see Bush-era tax cuts. This is the orange. You will see the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. That's the red. You will see the economic downturn. That's this blue. This tiny little line here, that's TARP and Fannie and Freddie. And these are the expenses that we paid to try to get our country back on track—the recovery.

What don't you see? You don't see Social Security. Don't let anybody tell you, Madam Speaker, that Social Security is the problem. It's not. Social Security is the promise one generation makes to another so that every senior in America will live in dignity. That's what it's for. That's what it's about. We are not being unreasonable when we demand protection of Social Security. It's not driving the deficit, and it does honor our seniors. And that is what it's all about. That's what we are going to do, and we are not going to give on that.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1309.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT
OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 340 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1309.

□ 1234

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011. I'd like to thank Ms. WATERS and all the Members from both sides of the aisle who helped to craft this bill.

On May 13, the Financial Services Committee favorably reported the Flood Insurance Reform Act by a unanimous vote of 54-0. This bill is important and reflects the hard work and bipartisan support of the Financial Services Committee.

It would reauthorize for 5 years the National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP. The bill would enact a series of reforms designed to, number one, improve NFIP's financial stability; two, to reduce the burden on taxpayers; three, restore integrity to the FEMA mapping system; four, to explore ways to increase private market participation; and, five, to help bring certainty to the housing market.

For over 40 years, taxpayers have subsidized flood insurance premiums for policyholders. To improve NFIP's financial stability, H.R. 1309 phases in actuarially sound rates for policy-

holders and phases out taxpayer-subsidized rates. As a result, the Congressional Budget Office stated that the bill generates \$4.2 billion; and absent a Katrina-like catastrophe, the bill will actually accelerate NFIP's payments on its \$17.75 billion debt to the taxpayer. As it stands, NFIP has already paid back taxpayers about \$1.8 billion.

But perhaps most importantly, H.R. 1309 eliminates a barrier to the development of a private flood insurance market and puts us on a path towards a responsible, long-term plan that eliminates taxpayer risk.

For the first time, policyholders can choose private flood insurance over government flood insurance without the risk of lender rejection; and the bill eliminates taxpayer-subsidized rates so that the private sector can offer consumers increasingly competitive rates as compared to the NFIP. Second, FEMA is required to solicit bids to determine the cost to the private sector, not to the taxpayer, bearing the risk of flood insurance.

Third, it requires that GAO and FEMA evaluate the feasibility of voluntary, community-based flood insurance. And, fourth, the bill reiterates FEMA's existing authority to purchase reinsurance from the private sector as an alternative to the U.S. Treasury and taxpayers serving as a backstop to NFIP.

Finally, the bill addresses many of the concerns that Members have raised with us about new maps, especially as they relate to the dam and levee decertifications. It allows communities to suspend the requirement to purchase flood insurance while they work to construct or fix their flood protection systems.

Madam Chairman, when Congress created NFIP, there was no viable private-sector flood insurance market. Taxpayers were providing increasing amounts of direct assistance through disaster relief to flood victims. Without reforms contained in this bill, taxpayers will never be paid back the debt they are owed; homeowners and businesses will have limited or no access to flood insurance; and Congress will inevitably have to bail out flood disaster victims, as it did prior to 1968. We cannot allow this to happen.

This bill is the first significant reform to the program in nearly a decade. The NFIP is too important to let lapse and too in debt to continue without reform. I look forward to today's amendment debate and urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, June 2, 2011.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing concerning H.R. 1309, the "Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011," which is scheduled for floor consideration soon. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1309 that fall within the Rule X jurisdic-

tion of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agree to forego action on this bill in order 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. 1309 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 the 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 requests your support for any such request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1309, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 2, 2011.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Ray-
burn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011. I agree that there are provisions in the legislation that fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting Floor consideration of H.R. 1309.

Further, I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. I will include this exchange of letters in our Committee Report on H.R. 1309 and the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 2, 2011.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011. H.R. 1309 has been marked up by the Committee on Financial Services. The amended version of the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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 consideration of this bill. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as waiving, reducing, or affecting the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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. 1309, as well as any similar or related legislation.

I ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the report on H.R. 1309 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you as this important measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

RALPH M. HALL,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Space, and Technology.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 2, 2011.

Hon. RALPH M. HALL,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space and
Technology, Rayburn House Office Build-
ing, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011. I agree that the section requiring a study on graduated risk in this important legislation falls under the jurisdiction of both the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Science, Space and Technology. I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 1309.

Further, I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. I will include this exchange of letters in our Committee Report on H.R. 1309 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011. Before I begin my remarks, I would like to thank Chairman SPENCER BACHUS, Chairwoman JUDY BIGGERT, and Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK for their assistance and support with this bill.

We were able to work in a bipartisan manner on this bill in our committee passing it on a vote of 54-0. The spirit of cooperation between Republicans and Democrats on this bill has been extremely welcome, and this is why I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

□ 1240

Madam Chairwoman, earlier this year I introduced similar legislation, H.R. 1026, the Flood Insurance Reform Priorities Act. A version of my bill passed the House last year on a bipartisan vote, and I hope that the bill offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois will also pass the House with significant support from both parties.

The flood insurance program is more important now than ever before. Floods are the most common natural disaster

and flood insurance is the most effective means for helping families to rebuild after a flood. Therefore, it is vital that flood insurance remain accessible, affordable and available to the 5.5 million homeowners with policies and the many more who may want or need to purchase them.

Unfortunately, the lack of a long-term authorization has placed the flood insurance program at risk. The program lapsed three times last year. These lapses meant that FEMA was not able to write new policies, renew expiring policies or increase coverage limits. Given the current crisis in the housing market, this inability in the flood insurance program is unacceptable and must be addressed. I am pleased that the gentlewoman's bill not only reauthorizes the program for 5 years but also provides the program with the tools it needs to return to a strong financial footing while protecting homeowners.

The bill also addresses the impact of new flood maps on communities. The mapping process has caused confusion and financial strain on homeowners who now find themselves in flood zones and subject to mandatory purchase requirements. I saw this firsthand in my home city of Los Angeles. Last year, I was able to assist homeowners in the Park Mesa Heights area of the city who had been mistakenly placed in a flood zone. In that case, FEMA acted quickly to respond to new data and correct the mistake. However, there are thousands of homeowners nationwide who now find themselves in flood zones and subject to mandatory purchase requirements.

The gentlewoman's bill would ease the financial strain on newly mapped homeowners by allowing for a 3-year delay of the mandatory purchase requirement and allows for a 5-year phase-in of actuarial rates afterwards. In addition, I know that the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, will be offering an amendment similar to the one I offered at markup that would extend the 3-year delay to 5 years. I know that the gentleman has worked with a bipartisan coalition of members of the House Levee Caucus, led by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and I look forward to passage of that amendment.

To make sure that FEMA issues the most accurate maps, the bill establishes a Technical Mapping Advisory Council. By improving the mapping process, the council would prevent instances of erroneous flood maps, like the one I encountered in Park Mesa Heights. The bill also makes other improvements to the program by phasing in actuarial rates for pre-FIRM properties, raising maximum coverage limits, providing notice to renters about contents insurance, and allowing homeowners that receive letters of map amendment to be reimbursed for their costs.

Madam Chairwoman, I believe that the gentlewoman from Illinois and I

have produced a good bill that will protect homeowners, the flood insurance program, and taxpayers. I hope that we can pass this bill today and that the Senate takes up flood insurance reform in short order so that we do not risk another lapse when the program expires on September 30 of this year. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her tremendous work on this bill, and I strongly urge an "aye" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the legislation that is before us today to reform the National Flood Insurance Program.

I would like to thank the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for their hard work to bring forth a bipartisan bill which addresses many of the concerns to a program hampered by extraordinary losses and currently facing about \$18 billion of debt.

H.R. 1309 provides a long-term extension of the National Flood Insurance Program, but it makes a significantly indebted program more fiscally sound. A 5-year reauthorization will give the certainty that is needed to a program that has been without it for the past 2 years. It is irresponsible and unfair to communities and individuals, especially those who live in flood-prone areas such as mine, to pass short-term extensions and allow temporary lapses when more than 5 million policyholders depend on it for financial security against flooding. Unless congressional action is taken, on September 30, 2011, these policyholders will again be put in danger of losing protection.

Unfortunately, the persistence of subsidized rates for properties in high-risk areas has left the NFIP underfunded and at risk. This bill makes needed reforms to put premiums more in line with risk by incorporating actuarial rates for at-risk properties. Increasing the limit on annual premium rate increases will gradually phase out subsidized premiums and help reduce taxpayer exposure. At the same time, this legislation allows properties relief from the mandatory purchase requirement for up to 3 years so they may be able to plan better for being newly mapped into special flood hazard areas.

Most importantly, this bill gives us a chance to give long-term certainty to policyholders as well as insurers who participate in the program. In a still unsure housing market, it is critical that we provide as much clarity as possible to current and future homeowners.

I am very pleased that this legislation looks at privatization initiatives and the possibilities that the private market as well as reinsurance can play in protecting communities against future flood damages. It is my hope that we will pass this bill.

Again, I want to congratulate the chairwoman for her hard work.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY). She has been very much involved in the development of this legislation and has worked very hard.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for yielding me this time. It has been a pleasure working with her. I would also like to thank Chairman BACHUS and Subcommittee Chair BIGGERT with whom we have worked. This is something that is important to both of our districts. I also thank Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, reauthorizes the National Flood Insurance Program for 5 years, but it also provides much needed reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program.

My district in Long Island, especially the community of Valley Stream, was included in the early rounds of FEMA's implementation of the flood map modernization process, and we have experienced much of the frustrations associated with the process. The whole idea of redoing what we're doing in this flood map is hopefully to prevent other Members of Congress from being frustrated as much as I have when they're trying to help their community.

Since our maps were enacted in the fall of 2009, I hear daily from our frustrated homeowners who are required to purchase flood insurance because of the updated maps and who feel they did not have the time or the tools necessary to understand and respond to the maps' results. H.R. 1309 contains provisions to better inform homeowners who are required to purchase flood insurance because of updated maps. For example, the bill requires FEMA to notify federally elected officials when there are changes to a flood zone or a map directly in their district.

The bill also requires FEMA to create a method for flood insurance policies to be paid for with installment payments, to ease the burden of having to pay the up-front full payment which can cost thousands of dollars. The bill also allows for homeowners who are in the reduced cost preferred risk policy program to enter into the 5-year phase-in for full actuarial rates when the extended rate expires in 2013.

To ensure the accuracy of the data and process FEMA used in creating the updated maps around the country, H.R. 1309 also creates a Technical Mapping Council made up of agency employees and experts in the field of mapping to develop new mapping standards for future map modernization activities. We need to use every tool available to bring relief to homeowners who are being burdened by FEMA's map modernization process, and the bill before us is a good start.

□ 1250

I would like also to say, once again, working with my colleague Mrs.

BIGGERT, working on the subcommittee has been a really good process. We have been able to bring our experiences, what happened in my community in Valley Stream and the frustration that homeowners have gone through. This legislation, although it doesn't cure everything, it will help constituents. And those who have not had their maps done yet, this is a good way for going forward.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FINCHER. Madam Chairman, I stand before you today because my district recently suffered severe flooding this spring and summer which we are now just beginning to recover from. The flooding of the Mississippi River, caused by an unusual amount of rain from back-to-back storms, left thousands of Tennesseans with flood damage. In my district alone, over 3,000 homes were damaged by storms and floods, and over 4,000 registered for disaster assistance.

Because the Mississippi River borders 110 miles of Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District, many small towns and farms are subject to unpredictable flooding each year. With this in mind, I am pleased to support H.R. 1309 today.

H.R. 1309 reauthorizes the National Flood Insurance Program for 5 years, which would provide some certainty for the economy and to the national housing market. During a period of 9.2 percent unemployment, we need this certainty to boost the housing construction industry and to help create badly needed jobs.

Another reason I am supporting H.R. 1309 today is this legislation encourages greater private sector participation in the National Flood Insurance Program. Madam Chairman, if we are to reduce Federal spending and the size of government in our lives, we need to put every program on the table and analyze ways we can encourage the private sector to shoulder more government risk.

I am pleased to support H.R. 1309 and encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I am so pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). He has a long history in this area, and the National Flood Insurance Act of 2004 bears his name. I appreciate his support.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy, as I appreciate her leadership and the leadership of Chair BIGGERT for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

It is true, I have been working in these areas for the last 10 years to make sure that the program is stable in the long term and encourages participation. Here we are raising rates where necessary to more accurately reflect flood risk.

For too long, homeowners in low-risk areas have been subsidizing those in

high-risk areas, all backed by the Federal taxpayers. This bill will make the program closer to being actuarially sound. I appreciate the work done to deal with repetitively flooded properties, which comprise 2 percent of the properties insured by the program but are responsible for 30 percent of the claims.

We do people no favors by paying them to rebuild in the same way, in the same place, time and time again in harm's way. That's why I strongly support the amendment that has been included in the en bloc to reauthorize and streamline a number of mitigation programs targeted towards repetitive flood programs.

I authored, with my colleague Doug Bereuter of Nebraska, a program to provide mitigation assistance for "severe repetitive loss properties." Unfortunately, since 2004, we found the program has been hard for FEMA to administer. When they have been able to get the program off the ground, it has allowed mitigation of almost 600 properties and saved \$125 million. But if we are able to move forward here, allowing the program to work right, it can make a huge, long-term difference both in the lives of property owners as well as the fiscal stability of the program.

The Waters amendment addresses the administrative programs by combining three mitigation programs into one streamlined provision, removes red tape, and enables FEMA to more easily work with the communities to mitigate the properties.

It is important to note that it does not cost the taxpayers any money. The money for mitigation comes from the flood insurance fund made up of premium dollars, and each dollar spent on mitigation saves the fund far more in the future.

I appreciate the work of Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. WATERS, Chair BACHUS, Ranking Member FRANK, and the committee to dig into the details here to ensure that FEMA will continue to have the tools it needs to address the properties that are costing the program the most. This is going to go a long way toward helping people out of the cycle of flooding and will help reduce the heavy drain that these properties have on the flood insurance program.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO), another great member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CANSECO. I would like to thank Chairman BIGGERT for her leadership on this bill which makes vital reforms to a troubled program.

Madam Chairman, we are all aware of the importance of flood insurance. Back in Texas, floods are a common occurrence. And when they happen, they destroy homes, property, and even entire communities.

Yes, this program provides flood victims with the monetary compensation necessary to begin rebuilding their

homes and their lives; yet we cannot forget that the only reason this program is still operating is because taxpayers have bailed it out as, by any measure, it has been insolvent.

That is why I am offering a very simple amendment to this bill that accomplishes three things:

Number one, it adds a provision to the bill that recognizes that while flood insurance is important to millions of Americans, this program is deeply in debt to the American taxpayer and there is currently no tangible plan to pay that money back;

Number two, it requires the administrator of FEMA to report back to the Congress within 6 months a 10-year plan to pay back the \$18 billion it currently owes taxpayers;

Number three, it adds accountability to a program that is far from being fiscally sound.

Let's keep in mind that if the National Flood Insurance Program were an initiative solely of the private sector, it would have declared bankruptcy long ago. Remember also that the person propping up this program, the American taxpayer, is very weary and tired from continually being held responsible for bailing out government's failed initiatives. For years the taxpayer has been asked to pick up the tab for government programs no matter how effective or how solvent they may be. The argument was that we could hold off worrying about overspending until we reached a crisis point. Well, with each American family now responsible for over \$120,000 of the Nation's debt and with annual trillion-plus dollar deficits, we are now at that crisis point.

Madam Chairman, my amendment and this bill are a step toward bringing fiscal responsibility back to this program. But, more importantly, it stands up for the American taxpayer whose voice has been ignored in Washington for too long.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT). Mr. SCOTT has been a strong advocate for his constituents, making sure that they could afford it. The installment part of this bill is all because of his work.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Let me commend Ms. WATERS and Mrs. BIGGERT for their extraordinarily important work on this legislation that is very much needed. People all across this country are very grateful that we are finally bringing some help here.

Madam Chair, nothing is more devastating to a family, to a community, than to lose, almost in the flick of an eye, to lose your home to a flood—I mean, totally underwater—to lose businesses. This happened in my State in a devastating manner in 2009. It was the worst flood in modern history of the State of Georgia. We lost over 20,000 homes throughout the State, but no area was more impacted than my own congressional district. Ten people

statewide lost their lives. There was a cost of over \$500 million to lost businesses and homes. And of those 10 people who lost their lives, seven of them were from my congressional district.

□ 1300

To even make this more pointed, seven of them were from one county in my district. Douglas County and Cobb County were just devastated by this flood. The communities of Austell and Powder Springs and Douglasville and Lithia Springs and College Park had to all virtually start over. Imagine yourself as a child with your whole school under water. It was an extraordinarily unfortunate situation. To make matters worse, Madam Chair, most of these individuals had no flood insurance. The reason they didn't have any flood insurance was the cost of flood insurance and the requirement that you had to pay for your flood insurance in one lump sum.

Thanks to this committee, thanks to this bill, thanks to the work of Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Chairman BACHUS, and Ranking Member FRANK, we have galvanized this. Thanks to the Federal Government and FEMA and now thanks to this bill and the amendment that you all were kind enough to adopt, which was mine, individuals can now purchase their flood insurance in monthly installments.

What a relief. What a great measure. This is what the American people expect of us—to come up here and immediately respond to a pressing need. This is a great day. It is a great bill. I want to thank all of you for working with us on this.

Madam Chairman, again, I want to thank Mrs. BIGGERT and Ms. WATERS for their excellent work, for a job well done. The people of this country thank us, too, as they can pay for their flood insurance in installments.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time both sides have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois has 20 minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 16½ minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan, CANDICE MILLER.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the gentlelady for yielding some time to me.

I hate to rain on this bipartisan parade. I know that there's a bipartisan effort here, but I think this program needs to be eliminated, not to be reformed, and I would start with this basic premise:

Why in the world is the Federal Government in the flood insurance business?

If you read the Constitution, what does it say? Actually, in the preamble, it says the first and foremost responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense. I can't find anywhere in that Constitution that says we're supposed to be in the

Federal flood insurance business. I just can't find it. I'll tell you what. I know we're trying to reform what, I think, is an unnecessary boondoggle, ridiculous program, but rather than reforming it, as I say, I think it needs to be eliminated.

This program started in 1968, and we started writing policies in 1972. The FEMA administrator just recently testified, I believe before the Financial Services Committee, and said this Federal Flood Insurance Program is in debt. As has been mentioned here, it is almost \$18 billion in debt. We have to raise the debt ceiling for the Federal Flood Insurance Program to about \$25 billion, and the FEMA administrator is telling us that it is always going to be in debt—forever—massive debt.

The biggest issue facing Congress today is what we are going to do about the \$14 trillion in debt we are currently faced with and raising the debt ceiling for that. So, as we are struggling with all of this, it is almost ludicrous to me that we are talking about raising the debt ceiling on a program that the Federal Government should not be involved in. One of the reasons it's not doing particularly well is—guess what? Big surprise—the Federal Government is probably not the best insurance agent in the world. I mean, when you see that 1 percent of the policyholders is getting 40 percent of the claims, something is seriously wrong.

I am going to be offering amendments shortly to eliminate this program, and I'll speak more to it at that time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), who has worked very hard to make sure that we open up communications with communities that are located in areas where flood insurance rate maps have not been updated in 20 years.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her courtesy and, of course, for her leadership on this issue. I also want to thank the subcommittee chairwoman, Mrs. BIGGERT, as well as Financial Services Chairman BACHUS and Ranking Member FRANK, for their bipartisan work on this piece of legislation.

I consulted with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle with regard to my amendment, and I believe this will be included en bloc with the other amendments.

Homeowners, businesses and regions throughout the country are hit by flood disasters every year, and I understand that, in such traumatic and desperate times, our communities must be prepared and equipped with the most up-to-date information and resources. I have repeatedly met with my constituents and district county judges, specifically Judge Eloy Vera from Starr County in South Texas, who experienced flooding issues recently. I learned that flood zone maps had not been updated for decades—decades—and that this hampered economic development when they were struck by a

flood recently. The reasons for outdated flood maps vary, and maps from the 1970s are not uncommon, but there is a need to strengthen the relationships between entities that handle flood insurance maps to address regional concerns.

My amendment is simple and bipartisan. It encourages FEMA, State emergency agencies and localities to increase communications to resolve outstanding issues and to provide necessary, tailored information in an effort to decrease the prevalence of outdated flood zone maps. Flood-threatened areas with outdated flood zone maps are not only contradictory, but can result in serious problems for the region. Increasing FEMA, State and local relationships is a practical and effective way to assist communities and to ensure a steady process to modernize flood maps.

So we are ready when a disaster strikes, I urge support for my common-sense amendment that will be included en bloc.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG).

Mr. BERG. This has been a very tough spring for North Dakota as well as for many other districts along these overflowing rivers. Unprecedented flooding has devastated many communities, leaving property destroyed, thousands without homes and hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland flooded. Roads and bridges are severely damaged as well.

This year's flooding is unusual both in the scope of its damage as well as in how long the flooding has lasted. Many North Dakotans purchased flood insurance to be prepared for the floods and to protect themselves and their families from the losses that these floods cause. Unfortunately, FEMA's current policy fails to account for a long-lasting flood event like the one that we've seen along the Missouri River.

I support the 30-day waiting period. If individuals purchase insurance 30 days before their properties are damaged, they should be protected regardless of when FEMA declares a "flood in progress." That declaration could be counties or even States away or unexpectedly worsened by the Corps' decision to increase the outflows from dams along the flooded rivers upstream and to do this with very little warning.

The Terry-Berg amendment would protect these individuals who have played by the rules. We need responsible policies that help plan for the uncertainty of natural disasters. We also need to protect and help the people who have suffered when these disasters hit home. This amendment will do both. So I urge my colleagues to support these victims by voting in favor of this amendment.

□ 1310

Ms. WATERS. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the ranking member for her work on this and the chairwoman of the subcommittee. Thank you for coming together and creating a process that allowed us to interact and work for our constituents.

Recognizing the gentleman from North Dakota, I have actually been on those flood flights that he's experiencing and am very appreciative of what he brought forward.

Today, I have a pretty simple amendment, I think, that addresses a real issue that we're having.

Over the past decade, there have been two real changes to the levee system that protects our communities in this country. The first, of course, was FEMA increasing the amount of information and the due diligence they're doing on recertification of levees. That's appropriate after Hurricane Katrina. Secondly, the private engineering firms that perform the recertifications are facing astronomically increased costs from their private insurers.

No one wants to insure a levee in a flood-prone area other than the rest of the community, thus the government. Together, these two changes have added increasingly high costs to our local communities as they're trying to protect their residents and keep their levees up to standards. It has created an extra burden on these communities that they can ill afford. This amendment offers a solution.

The Army Corps of Engineers stands ready and able to perform these levee certifications. In many cases, they built the levees. They can do it at a significantly reduced cost to the local communities. But under legislation passed in the 2000 Water Resources Development Act, State and local communities cannot hire the Corps of Engineers to do the work; they must first go to private contractors. It's exactly what happened in my town of Mankato, Minnesota. The north Mankato levee, which was designed and built by the Corps, needed to be recertified because of these changes. Because they couldn't use the Corps of Engineers, our local officials had to scramble and go out of their way to find a private contractor willing to do the work at an added cost of tens of thousands of dollars. At no fault to the private contractors, their insurance of liability was so high they had to pass the cost on to the local communities.

This approach was worked on in the last Congress with then-Representative BOOZMAN, now-Senator BOOZMAN. It has the support of the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Towns and Townships. And here's the good thing: The Congressional Budget Office has certified this amendment will cost nothing to the taxpayers. Our taxpayers on the local level are paying far more as it is. This is a way to get it right, use the Corps that we already have, save taxpayers money, increase

the efficiency of our levees, and reduce the claims that are made by this.

I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation, and once again I thank the committee for their outstanding work on the underlying bill.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. I want to thank the gentlelady from Illinois and the entire Financial Services Committee for working with us on this amendment and recognizing the tragedy and disaster that's currently occurring along the Missouri River, with my constituents, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri.

What occurred here is that at the beginning, when they started realizing there was going to be flooding and the Corps had to run the traps through the dam system, one government agency started telling people downriver to buy flood insurance. Then FEMA steps in and sets a start-of-flood or flood-in-progress date that nullified what the constituents and people bought.

Now, what the Terry-Berg amendment does is, it would protect those individuals during a flood in progress if the individual has purchased flood insurance and has not sustained damage or loss of property within that 30-day window. That's the clear language of the policies that they were purchasing that had been nullified by FEMA's declaration. This amendment does not dispute the 30-day waiting period—which is designed to discourage people from waiting until a flood is imminent to buy insurance—it simply ensures American families who purchase flood insurance are covered if they sustain damage after the declaration of a flood in progress. This resolves the conflict caused between two government agencies and adheres to the intent, and I want to thank the Financial Services Committee for including this in the en bloc package.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her leadership on this important issue.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1309 and in support of my en bloc amendment that aims to provide more certainty to the National Flood Insurance Program.

My amendment calls on FEMA to take into account the effects and implications of weather conditions when making a flood-in-progress determination. Currently, FEMA's flood determinations are made independently by a FEMA adjuster, allowing a significant amount of room for subjectivity. I appreciate the need for FEMA's flexibility, but taking a more formulaic approach to flood events will provide increased certainty to our river communities. My amendment would also require FEMA to review the process for

providing public notification of a flood event.

When the Missouri River started flooding earlier this summer, FEMA was delinquent in reporting their flood-in-progress determination to the public. That determination was made June 1 but was not announced until June 6. For 5 days, we had no way of knowing that FEMA had made this determination, impacting policyholders and new homebuyers.

We believe that FEMA must look at the policies in place and make recommendations for a more objective and precise determination process, along with public notification standards that will keep policyholders better informed. It is critical that FEMA develop enhanced procedures for flood determinations and communications with the public.

I urge support for my amendment and for the underlying bill.

Ms. WATERS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With the NFIP's authorization set to expire on September 30, it's really critical that the House pass the bill and work with the Senate to shape a final commonsense reform measure. We have to avoid a recurrence of what happened in the last Congress when the program lapsed and caused turmoil in a recovering housing market. Houses couldn't be closed if they didn't have insurance and if they had a mortgage. At that time, it was simply extended without any reforms. So if there is no viable private insurance market, we're going to have to pay more. So I would suggest that we really look forward to passing this bill.

Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to thank my good friend from Illinois for the time. She has been a wonderful advocate on behalf of homeowners and renters of the United States, and especially in my area.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program as administered by FEMA through the year 2016.

Granted, the bill before us is not perfect, but homeowners and businesses in my congressional district—that stretches from Miami Beach all the way down to Key West—deserve to see stability brought to this vital program.

Since September of 2008, the NFIP has had 11 short-term extensions, and just last year alone the program was allowed to lapse three times. That is inexcusable. These lapses meant that FEMA was not able to write new policies, renew expiring policies, or increase coverage limits. And for a program that insures over 90 percent of all flood insurance policies nationwide—40 percent of those being in my home State of Florida—this is rightly inexcusable. Just as bad, for each of the 53

days that the NFIP was lapsed, over 1,400 homebuyers who wanted to purchase homes located in floodplains were unable to close on their home purchases.

□ 1320

It is necessary to demonstrate these irresponsible lapses will not occur again; and those of us in south Florida and the Miami Beach area to the Keys will stay prepared for any event that could occur during hurricane season, which is upon us again, and we need to know that the NFIP is there to help us recover. Let us not let another lapse happen right in the middle of hurricane season.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this much-needed, way overdue important reauthorization.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time, and let's pass this bill.

Ms. WATERS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to our distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Chairman, this month we're all focused on the debt and the deficit and our negotiations to try to balance the budget. So it's with great pride that I tell the House that all 54 members of the Financial Services Committee, both Republicans and Democrats, have unanimously passed out of the committee a bipartisan piece of legislation which will save the U.S. Government and the American taxpayers \$4.2 billion over the next 10 years. It does that without decreasing any of the benefits of the program. It does it in some commonsense ways.

One is that premiums will be actuarially sound. They will be based on the risk, and we will be eliminating subsidies to bring the program into balance. We further insulate taxpayers from losses by adding a reinsurance provision whereby part of the premium that people pay, just as if they do on their house or for wind coverage if they have a home on the beach—part of it is in private insurance laid off into reinsurance. The program today, if you eat up the reserves, then the Treasury is responsible for making up the difference.

After this legislation goes into effect, there will be reinsurance that will be purchased, and the taxpayer will only be exposed after risk-based premiums are exhausted, reinsurance in addition to that is exhausted. So we reduce taxpayer exposure to a tremendous extent.

Also, people have said, why is there not private insurance? Well, we have a provision in here, supported by both parties, that if the private market comes in and offers insurance for the same coverage that people will be free to choose that coverage as opposed to the national flood insurance offered by the government.

You've heard the gentlelady from Florida express her concern that 11 times this legislation has been extended. Where it has been extended, it has retarded economic growth along our coastlines, along our rivers; and you can actually imagine that a lot of the economic activity and the job creation in our country comes in these areas.

And today I think there would be no one in the House that says we want to put the economies of those areas on hold for 3 months or 6 months. We want the economy to have much fewer problems. We don't want to stop home sales; we don't want to stop commercial developments in those areas.

There are other shortcomings with the present program. One is there are disputes over whether or not land should be included within the floodplains, whether coverage should be offered. We make improvements there. We returned to a program several years ago where there's a technical advisory committee that, in addition to FEMA, will make these decisions, and it will be a more professionally based decision. Those areas which are spending money, local areas like Los Angeles, California, Ms. WATERS' district; along the Mississippi River, where local governments have come together and made expenditures to protect against floods, there's acknowledgment of their work, and the phase-in period for them is extended to encourage more of that.

All in all, I think that I would just go back to where I started and say that the Financial Services Committee is no different from any other committee in this House. There are conservatives, there are liberals, there are moderates that serve on that committee, both Republicans and Democrats. But all 54 members—let me stress that again—all 54 members of the Financial Services Committee voted unanimously for this legislation. And we are prepared in our debate as we go forward to accept amendments offered by several other Members, both Democrats and Republicans, to accept those amendments where it does not do violence to the program, where it doesn't increase costs or exposure to the taxpayer.

All in all, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, who produced this legislation. I think our constituents for months have been saying to the Congress, please set aside your political differences, please try to work together, please try to cooperate when you can do so without violating your principles.

And Mrs. BIGGERT and Ms. WATERS, the subcommittee ranking member on her side, they put aside their differences. I worked with Chairman FRANK. We had hearings, we had mark-ups, and we produced something that I thought was not possible, and that's a bill that we all think will improve the program tremendously, will reduce the cost and reduce taxpayer exposure and really make the mapping better and

the protection for our communities in flood-prone areas work more effectively.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close. I am very pleased and proud to be a cosponsor of this tremendous comprehensive legislation.

I would like to thank the chairwoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her work, her leadership, and her cooperation. And I would like to thank both the chairman of our committee, Mr. BACHUS, and the ranking member, Mr. FRANK, for their support and their cooperation on this legislation.

□ 1330

You heard Mr. BACHUS, our chairman, recount for you that 54 members of the committee unanimously voted to support this legislation. That is pretty unheard of. And I think that the committee, the entire committee is to be congratulated for the tremendous work that we all put in to making sure that we have comprehensive legislation that would afford protection for our citizens and, at the same time, as was mentioned, reduce the costs, but recognize that this has been a long time in coming.

So as a cosponsor of this bill, H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, this bipartisan effort that has brought us to this point, I would like to say that all of the Members who have spoken today, for the most part, on both sides of the aisle, have been complimentary of this comprehensive work. Of course, we did have one Member who disagreed with government's involvement in this flood insurance program. That's a rather radical view. I think most Members of this Congress believe that we have a responsibility to give support to those who are the victims of natural disaster, disasters that have been caused through, of course, no fault of their own. They're pleased that they have an opportunity to get some protection, with the help of their government, and to make sure that their homes and their families can be supported at a time that can be very traumatic in their lives.

Again, I will have to remind all of my colleagues that unfortunately the lack of a long-term authorization has placed the flood insurance program at risk. The program lapsed three times last year. These lapses meant that FEMA was not able to write new policies, renew expiring policies, or increase coverage limits.

Today, you have heard the Members of Congress again on both sides of the aisle give appreciation for the mapping reform that we have included in this legislation, for the outreach that we have included in this en bloc amendment that would allow the constituents of all of our districts to understand better what FEMA is doing, how it's doing, and how they can be a part of it. I am also pleased that included in this en bloc amendment is protection for small businesses. And I am very, very pleased that we have seen this as an effort not only to reauthorize, but to correct some of the weaknesses in

the program and to strengthen the program in general.

With that, Madam Chair, I would ask for support for this bill. I know that there are some amendments that are being introduced a little bit later on; and I think that, again, you will see bipartisan support for most of these amendments. And I look forward to completing the bill with the amendments and to sending this bill on, where I believe we will have like support on the Senate side, and eventually to the President's desk. It's about time. I think that this country's going to be better off for it.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1309. It's a bill to reform and reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program. I think that we have had a great debate, and it certainly is a pleasure to have a bill that has such bipartisan support. I think it's such an important bill.

It's going to enact a series of reforms designed to improve NFIP's financial stability, reduce the burden on taxpayers, restore integrity to the FEMA mapping system, and explore ways to increase the private market participation and help bring certainty to the housing market. It's a \$4.2 billion revenue raiser. And I think that that's very important too, that we will really be able to change the scope of this. If we go back to 1968 when this started, there was no private insurance, and this is why this happened. And we have to keep it that way, or we will pay so much more for disaster relief when this happens to so many people who live in floodplains.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I really thank the members of the Financial Services Committee, particularly Ms. WATERS and Mr. FRANK, and on our side Mr. BACHUS, the chairman.

SMARTERSAFER.ORG,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2011.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: SmarterSafer.org, a diverse coalition of taxpayer advocates, environmental organizations and insurance interests, urges you to quickly take up comprehensive flood insurance reform, like H.R. 1309, a bill that extends the program for five years and makes meaningful reform to the program.

Congress must act quickly to reauthorize the program before it expires in September, and must couple any reauthorization with meaningful reforms. The flood program is almost \$18 billion in debt to the U.S. Treasury, and that amount will likely grow as a result of recent flooding. To ensure the viability of the program so that those at risk can rebuild after a disaster, to protect taxpayers, and to protect environmentally sensitive areas, Congress must make significant reforms to the flood insurance program.

A comprehensive bill, like H.R. 1309, which was the subject of significant hearings and debate, is needed. When you consider this

bill, we ask that you look at adopting changes to do the following: phase out all subsidies, extend and streamline the mitigation grants program including making permanent the severe repetitive loss mitigation program; ensure the program is not expanded to additional coverages; and allow for no mapping or mandatory purchase delays. Though we believe that H.R. 1309 is a step in the right direction, with these changes you will be putting the flood program on a sustainable path. Under H.R. 1309 flood maps will be up to date and accurate; subsidies in the program will be phased out; and FEMA is authorized to purchase reinsurance to cover losses and protect taxpayers. We urge you to schedule this bill for consideration.

Sincerely,

Environmental Organizations—American Rivers, Ceres, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Republicans for Environmental Protection, Sierra Club, The Nature Conservancy; Consumer and Taxpayer Advocates—American Conservative Union, Americans for Prosperity, Americans for Tax Reform, Center on Risk, Regulation, and Markets—The Heartland Institute, Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Insurer Interests—Allianz of America, Association of Bermuda Insurers and Reinsurers, Chubb, Liberty Mutual Group, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Flood Determination Association, Reinsurance Association of America, Swiss Re, USAA; Housing—National Low Income Housing Coalition, National Leased Housing Association; Allied Organizations—American Consumer Institute, Friends of the Earth, International Code Council, National Fire Protection Association, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Zurich.

MAY 27, 2011.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the undersigned associations, we are writing to respectfully urge you to schedule floor consideration of H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011 at the first available opportunity. Significant reform and long-term reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) is critically important to the citizens and taxpayers who rely on this vital flood protection program.

Without action, on September 30, 2011, the NFIP authorization will expire. More than 5.6 million policyholders depend on the NFIP as their main source of protection against flooding, the most common natural disaster in the United States. A long-term extension is necessary to provide certainty to recovering real estate, insurance and financial markets and every participant in the economy that the NFIP effects—homeowners, small business owners, builders, real estate professionals, mortgage lenders, investors, insurance agents and insurance companies. All these entities depend on the program for flood damage protection.

H.R. 1309 includes both a long-term reauthorization and important reforms that will optimize the current program with important coverage and rate reforms, needed improvements to the floodplain mapping and appeals processes, and other key reforms which would encourage program participation and put the NFIP back on the path to sound financial footing.

As you know, H.R. 1309 was favorably reported by the House Financial Services Committee with unanimous, bipartisan support. We thank the bill sponsors and the Committee for their leadership on this important issue. We respectfully urge you to work for quick passage of this legislation by the full House.

Sincerely,

American Bankers Association, American Bankers Insurers Association, American Financial Services Association, American Insurance Association, American Land Title Association, American Resort Development Association, American Securitization Forum, Chamber Southwest LA, Commercial Real Estate Finance Council, Consumer Bankers Association, Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers, Credit Union National Association, The Financial Services Roundtable, Independent Community Bankers of America.

Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, International Council of Shopping Centers, Mortgage Bankers Association, National Association of Federal Credit Unions, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Association of REALTORS®, National Apartment Association, National Multi-Housing Council, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, The Real Estate Roundtable, Reinsurance Association of America, Risk and Insurance Management Society, Inc.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I do want to talk about the flood insurance program, one that I think enjoys great bipartisan support. I want to thank the chairwoman for her guidance and, obviously, Ms. WATERS for her leadership as well.

Five million, actually, residential and commercial properties across the land rely on this flood insurance. They depend on it for stability. And we have to recognize that there, indeed, are problems. We have debt; there is no question about that. It's undercapitalized, which is placing the taxpayers at risk. But this bill would minimize taxpayer risk by making the program more self-sufficient over time by expanding the private sector's role while allowing—and not allowing for coverage gaps.

It also moves toward actuarially sound rates and creates a new flooding map, which creates a platform upon which risk can be measured and priced by the private sector. This is exactly the kind of solution that we need to have here in the United States Congress, to be able to still provide coverage in areas that need it so desperately and yet move us gradually over to actuarially sound rates.

With that, I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Flood Insurance Reform Act, H.R. 1309.

Flood insurance is critical for homeowners in our area who rely on this program to protect their hard-earned investments in their homes. The National Flood Insurance Program is the

primary source of flood insurance for Americans and people in our district. About 5.6 million homes and businesses nationwide rely on NFIP.

In our district, in Houston and East Harris County, Texas, flood insurance is a top priority. The Harris County Flood Control District does an impressive job of implementing new flood control measures in the way of maintaining bayous, building retention basins, and implementing drainage features, but even the best flood control will be defeated by a particularly bad storm.

While I support the underlying bill, I am especially supportive of measures that I first advocated for in 2007. During Floor Debate of the 2007 bill, I offered an amendment that was adopted, and it is also included in the bill we are debating today.

Our language provides for a limited, five-year phase-in of flood insurance premiums for low-income homeowners or renters whose primary residence is placed within a flood plain through an updating of flood insurance program maps. These homes can be valued at no more than 75 percent of the median home value for the state in which the property is located. This is important to residents of our district, who need the stability and stability that this provision allows.

I want to thank Chairman BACHUS and Ranking Member FRANK for their leadership on this issue and for including this important provision.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011 (H.R. 1309).

The National Flood Insurance Program is the primary source of reliable and affordable flood insurance for over 5.6 million homes and businesses. Today's bipartisan legislation reauthorizes the program for five years through FY 2016 and contains numerous reforms designed to put the program on firmer financial footing.

The bill is supported by the National Association of Realtors, the National Association of Homebuilders, the American Insurance Association, the Property Casualty Insurers Association and the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, and in my judgment, strikes the proper balance between providing Americans with the flood insurance protection they need at a price taxpayers can afford.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2354.

□ 1340

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 11, 2011, the bill had been read through page 24, line 23.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

An amendment by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

An amendment by Mr. TONKO of New York.

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

An amendment by Mr. WU of Oregon.

An amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

An amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 196, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

AYES—224

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach

Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huelskamp
Huisenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent

Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
McCaul
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—196

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield

Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu

Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Finer
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Price (TX)

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeke
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)

Johnson (GA)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Kind
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Baca
Deutch
Giffords
Heinrich

Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Lujan

□ 1406

Messrs. KEATING, HIMES, and DOGGETT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. SOUTHERLAND changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 250, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

AYES—170

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Hanabusa
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller (WA)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)

Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—250

Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier

Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA) McCaul
 Grimm McClintock
 Guinta McCotter
 Guthrie McHenry
 Hall McIntyre
 Hanna McKeon
 Harper McKinley
 Harris McMorris
 Hartzler Rodgers
 Hastings (WA) Meehan
 Heck Mica
 Hensarling Miller (FL)
 Herger Miller (MI)
 Herrera Beutler Miller, Gary
 Huelskamp Mulvaney
 Huizenga (MI) Murphy (PA)
 Hultgren Myrick
 Hunter Neugebauer
 Hurt Noem
 Issa Nugent
 Jenkins Nunes
 Johnson (IL) Nunnelee
 Johnson (OH) Olson
 Johnson, Sam Owens
 Jones Palazzo
 Jordan Paul
 Kelly Paulsen
 King (IA) Pence
 King (NY) Perlmutter
 Kingston Peterson
 Kinzinger (IL) Petri
 Kissell Pitts
 Kline Platts
 Labrador Poe (TX)
 Lamborn Pompeo
 Landry Posey
 Latham Price (GA)
 LaTourette Quayle
 Latta Rahall
 Lewis (CA) Reed
 Long Rehberg
 Lucas Reichert
 Luetkemeyer Renacci
 Lummis Ribble
 Lungren, Daniel Rigell
 E. Rivera
 Mack Roby
 Manzullo Roe (TN)
 Marchant Rogers (AL)
 Marino Rogers (KY)
 Matheson Rogers (MI)
 McCarthy (CA) Rohrabacher

Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 DeFazio
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Baca Heinrich
 Bishop (UT) Hinchey
 Deutch Holden
 Giffords Hoyer

NOT VOTING—11

Lujan
 Pearce
 Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1411

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 154, noes 266,
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]
 AYES—154
 Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baldwin
 Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Langevin
 Clarke (NY)
 Stutzman
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fortenberry
 Frank (MA)
 Garamendi
 Green, Al
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Amash
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barrow
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bisheshk
 Berg
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy

NOES—266

Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Costa
 Costello
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen

Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lewis (CA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Walden
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters

Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Rahall
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Vislosky
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Baca Giffords
 Barletta Heinrich
 Canseco Hinchey
 Deutch Holden

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining in the
 vote.

□ 1414

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No.
 541, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been
 present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAM-
 BORN) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the noes
 prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 164, noes 259,
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—164

Adams Griffin (AR) Noem
 Aderholt Griffith (VA) Nougent
 Akin Hall Nunes
 Alexander Hanna Nunnelee
 Amash Harris Olson
 Bachmann Hartzler Paul
 Bachus Hayworth Paulsen
 Benishek Heck Pence
 Berg Hensarling Petri
 Bilirakis Herger Pitts
 Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler
 Black Huelskamp Poe (TX)
 Blackburn Huizenga (MI) Pompeo
 Bonner Hultgren Posey
 Bono Mack Hunter Price (GA)
 Boustany Hurt Quayle
 Brady (TX) Issa Rehberg
 Broun (GA) Jenkins Reichert
 Bucshon Johnson (IL) Ribble
 Burgess Johnson (OH) Rigell
 Burton (IN) Jordan Roe (TN)
 Calvert King (IA) Rogers (MI)
 Campbell Kingston Rohrabacher
 Canseco Kinzinger (IL) Rokita
 Cantor Kissell Rooney
 Capito Kline Royce
 Cassidy Labrador Runyan
 Chabot Lamborn Ryan (WI)
 Chaffetz Landry Scalise
 Coble Lankford Schmidt
 Coffman (CO) Latta Schock
 Conaway Lewis (CA) Schweikert
 Cravaack Long Scott (SC)
 Crawford Luetkemeyer Scott, Austin
 Culberson Lummis Sensenbrenner
 DesJarlais Lungren, Daniel
 Duffy E. Sessions
 Duncan (SC) Mack Smith (NE)
 Duncan (TN) Manzullo Southerland
 Farenthold Marchant Stearns
 Flake Marino Stutzman
 Fleming Matheson Sullivan
 Flores McCarthy (CA) Terry
 Forbes McClintock Thornberry
 Fortenberry McHenry Tipton
 Foxx McKeon Walberg
 Franks (AZ) McKinley Walsh (IL)
 Gallegly McMorris Webster
 Gardner Rodgers West
 Garrett Mica Westmoreland
 Gohmert Miller (FL) Whitfield
 Goodlatte Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)
 Gosar Mulvaney Wittman
 Gowdy Murphy (PA) Womack
 Graves (GA) Myrick Woodall
 Graves (MO) Neugebauer Young (IN)

NOES—259

Ackerman Chandler Ellison
 Altmire Chu Ellmers
 Andrews Cielline Emerson
 Austria Clarke (MI) Engel
 Baca Clarke (NY) Eshoo
 Baldwin Clay Farr
 Barletta Cleaver Fattah
 Barrow Clyburn Filner
 Bartlett Cohen Fincher
 Barton (TX) Cole Fitzpatrick
 Bass (CA) Connolly (VA) Fleischmann
 Bass (NH) Conyers Frank (MA)
 Becerra Cooper Frelinghuysen
 Berkley Costa Fudge
 Berman Costello Garamendi
 Biggert Courtney Gerlach
 Bilbray Crenshaw Gibbs
 Bishop (GA) Critz Gibson
 Bishop (NY) Crowley Gingrey (GA)
 Blumenauer Cuellar Gonzalez
 Boren Cummings Granger
 Boswell Davis (CA) Green, Al
 Brady (PA) Davis (IL) Green, Gene
 Braley (IA) Davis (KY) Grijalva
 Brooks DeFazio Grimm
 Brown (FL) DeGette Guinta
 Buchanan DeLauro Guthrie
 Buerkle Denham Gutierrez
 Butterfield Dent Hanabusa
 Camp Diaz-Balart Harper
 Capps Dicks Hastings (FL)
 Capuano Dingell Hastings (WA)
 Cardoza Doggett Higgins
 Carnahan Dold Himes
 Carney Donnelly (IN) Hinojosa
 Carson (IN) Hirono Holt
 Carter Dreier Hochul
 Castor (FL) Edwards

Honda Inslee Moore
 Insee Moran
 Israel Murphy (CT)
 Jackson (IL) Nadler
 Jackson Lee Napolitano
 (TX) Neal
 Johnson (GA) Olver
 Johnson, E. B. Owens
 Johnson, Sam Palazzo
 Jones Pallone
 Kaptur Pascrell
 Keating Pastor (AZ)
 Kelly Payne
 Kildee Pelosi
 Kind Perlmutter
 King (NY) King (NY) Peters
 Kucinich Peterson
 Lance Pingree (ME)
 Langevin Platts
 Larsen (WA) Polis
 Larson (CT) Price (NC)
 Latham Quigley
 LaTourette Rahall
 Lee (CA) Rangel
 Levin Reed
 Lewis (GA) Renacci
 Lipinski Reyes
 LoBiondo Richardson
 Loeb sack Richmond
 Lofgren, Zoe Rivera
 Lowey Roby
 Lucas Rogers (AL)
 Lynch Rogers (KY)
 Maloney Ros-Lehtinen
 Markey Roskam
 Matsui Ross (AR)
 McCarthy (NY) Ross (FL)
 McCaul Rothman (NJ)
 McCollum Roybal-Allard
 McCotter Ruppertsberger
 McDermott Rush
 McGovern Ryan (OH)
 McIntyre Sanchez, Linda
 McNeerney T.
 Meehan Sanchez, Loretta
 Meeks Sarbanes
 Michaud Schakowsky
 Miller (MI) Schiff
 Miller (NC) Schilling
 Miller, George Schrader

NOT VOTING—8

Deutch Hinchey Luján
 Giffords Holden Pearce
 Heinrich Hoyer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CAMPBELL) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1418

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 249, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

AYES—173

Ackerman Ackerman
 Andrews Andrews
 Baca Baca
 Baldwin Baldwin
 Bartlett Bartlett
 Bass (CA) Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH) Bass (NH)
 Becerra Becerra
 Berkley Berkley
 Berman Berman
 Bishop (GA) Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY) Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer Blumenauer
 Boswell Boswell
 Brady (PA) Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA) Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL)
 Butterfield Butterfield
 Camp Johnson (GA)
 Capps Johnson, E. B.
 Capuano Jones
 Cardoza Kaptur
 Carnahan Keating
 Carson (IN) Carney
 Castor (FL) Kind
 Chandler Kucinich
 Chu Langevin
 Cicilline Larsen (WA)
 Clarice Lee (CA)
 Clarke (MI) Levin
 Clarke (NY) Lewis (GA)
 Clay Lipinski
 Cleaver LoBiondo
 Clyburn Loeb sack
 Cohen Lofgren, Zoe
 Connolly (VA) Lowey
 Conyers Lynch
 Courtney Maloney
 Crowley Markey
 Cummings Matheson
 Davis (CA) Matsui
 Davis (IL) McCarthy (NY)
 DeFazio McCollum
 DeGette McDermott
 DeLauro McGovern
 Dicks McNeerney
 Dingell Meeks
 Doggett Michaud
 Dold Miller (NC)
 Edwards Miller, George
 Ellison Moore
 Engel Moran
 Eshoo Murphy (CT)
 Farr Nadler
 Fattah Napolitano
 Filner Neal
 Frank (MA) Olver
 Fudge Owens
 Garamendi Pallone

NOES—249

Adams Cantor
 Aderholt Capito
 Akin Carter
 Alexander Cassidy
 Altmire Chabot
 Amash Chaffetz
 Austria Coble
 Bachmann Coffman (CO)
 Bachus Cole
 Barletta Conaway
 Barrow Cooper
 Barton (TX) Costa
 Benishek Costello
 Berg Cravaack
 Biggert Crawford
 Bilbray Crenshaw
 Bilirakis Critz
 Bishop (UT) Cuellar
 Black Culberson
 Blackburn Davis (KY)
 Bonner Denham
 Bono Mack Dent
 Boren DesJarlais
 Boustany Diaz-Balart
 Brady (TX) Donnelly (IN)
 Brooks Doyle
 Broun (GA) Dreier
 Buchanan Guinta
 Bucshon Duncan (SC)
 Buerkle Duncan (TN)
 Burgess Ellmers
 Burton (IN) Emerson
 Calvert Farenthold
 Campbell Fincher
 Canseco Fitzpatrick

Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree (ME)
 Platts
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Ross (AR)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Walden
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Hayworth	McKinley	Ryan (WI)	Bass (NH)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Hurt	Miller, Gary	Schmidt
Heck	McMorris	Scalise	Becerra	Himes	Paul	Issa	Murphy (PA)	Schock
Hensarling	Rodgers	Schilling	Berkley	Hirono	Payne	Jenkins	Myrick	Schweikert
Hergert	Meehan	Schmidt	Berman	Hochul	Pelosi	Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer	Scott (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Mica	Schock	Biggert	Holt	Perlmutter	Johnson (OH)	Noem	Scott, Austin
Hinojosa	Miller (FL)	Schrader	Bishop (NY)	Honda	Peters	Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Sensenbrenner
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Schweikert	Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)	Jordan	Nunes	Sessions
Huizenga (MI)	Miller, Gary	Scott (SC)	Boswell	Huelskamp	Platts	Kelly	Nunnelee	Sewell
Hultgren	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin	Brady (PA)	Inslee	Polis	King (IA)	Olson	Shimkus
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Brown (FL)	Israel	Price (NC)	King (NY)	Palazzo	Shuster
Hurt	Myrick	Sessions	Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Quigley	Kingston	Paulsen	Simpson
Issa	Neugebauer	Sewell	Capps	Jackson Lee	Rangel	Kinzinger (IL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Smith (NE)
Jenkins	Noem	Shimkus	Capuano	(TX)	Reichert	Kline	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (IL)	Nugent	Shuster	Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Reyes	Labrador	Petri	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Nunes	Simpson	Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson	Lance	Pitts	Southerland
Johnson, Sam	Nunnelee	Smith (NE)	Carney	Jones	Richmond	Lankford	Poe (TX)	Stearns
Jordan	Olson	Smith (NJ)	Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ross (AR)	Larson (CT)	Pompeo	Stivers
Kelly	Palazzo	Smith (TX)	Castor (FL)	Keating	Rothman (NJ)	Latham	Posey	Stutzman
King (IA)	Pence	Southerland	Chandler	Kildee	Roybal-Allard	LaTourette	Price (GA)	Sullivan
King (NY)	Peterson	Stearns	Chu	Kind	Ruppersberger	Latta	Quayle	Sutton
Kingston	Petri	Stivers	Cicilline	Kissell	Rush	Lewis (CA)	Rahall	Terry
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Stutzman	Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda	Long	Reed	Thompson (MS)
Kissell	Poe (TX)	Sullivan	Clarke (NY)	Lamborn	T.	Lucas	Rehberg	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Pompeo	Sutton	Clay	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Thornberry
Labrador	Posey	Terry	Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	Lummis	Ribble	Tiberi
Lamborn	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)	Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky	Lungren, Daniel	Rigell	Tipton
Lance	Quayle	Thornberry	Cohen	Levin	Schiff	E.	Rivera	Turner
Lankford	Rahall	Tiberi	Connolly (VA)	Lewis (GA)	Schrader	Mack	Roby	Upton
Larson (CT)	Reed	Tipton	Conyers	Lipinski	Schwartz	Manzullo	Roe (TN)	Visclosky
Latham	Rehberg	Turner	Cooper	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)	Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Latta	Reichert	Upton	Courtney	Loebsock	Scott, David	Marino	Rogers (KY)	Walsh (IL)
Lewis (CA)	Renacci	Visclosky	Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano	McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Webster
Long	Ribble	Walberg	Cummings	Lowey	Sherman	McCaul	Rohrabacher	West
Lucas	Rigell	Walden	Davis (CA)	Lynch	Shuler	McClintock	Rokita	Westmoreland
Luetkemeyer	Rivera	Walsh (IL)	Davis (IL)	Maloney	Sires	McCotter	Rooney	Whitfield
Lummis	Roby	Webster	DeFazio	Markey	Slaughter	McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
Lungren, Daniel	Roe (TN)	West	DeGette	Matheson	Smith (WA)	McKeon	Roskam	Wittman
E.	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland	DeLauro	Matsui	Speier	McKinley	Ross (FL)	Wolf
Mack	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield	Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Stark	McMorris	Royce	Womack
Manzullo	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)	Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (CA)	Rodgers	Runyan	Woodall
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Wittman	Doggett	McDermott	Tierney	Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Yoder
Marino	Rokita	Wolf	Dold	McGovern	Tonko	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Womack	Edwards	McIntyre	Towns	Miller (FL)	Scalise	Young (FL)
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall	Ellison	McNerney	Tsongas	Miller (MI)	Schilling	Young (IN)
McClintock	Roskam	Yoder	Engel	Meeks	Van Hollen	NOT VOTING—8		
McCotter	Ross (FL)	Young (AK)	Eshoo	Michaud	Velazquez	Deutch	Hinchey	Luján
McHenry	Royce	Young (FL)	Farr	Miller (NC)	Walden	Giffords	Holden	Pearce
McIntyre	Runyan	Young (IN)	Fligner	Miller, George	Walz (MN)	Heinrich	Landry	
McKeon	Ryan (OH)		Fortenberry	Moore	Wasserman			
			Frank (MA)	Moran	Schultz			
			Fudge	Mulvaney	Waters			
			Garamendi	Murphy (CT)	Watt			
			Gibson	Nadler	Waxman			
			Green, Al	Napolitano	Welch			
			Grijalva	Neal	Wilson (FL)			
			Gutierrez	Olver	Woolsey			
			Hanabusa	Owens	Wu			
			Hanna	Pallone	Yarmuth			
			Hastings (FL)	Pascrell				

NOT VOTING—9

Deutch	Hinchey	LaTourette
Giffords	Holden	Luján
Heinrich	Landry	Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1423

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 244, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—179

Ackerman	Baca	Bartlett
Andrews	Baldwin	Bass (CA)

NOES—244

Adams	Capito	Forbes
Aderholt	Carter	Fox
Akin	Cassidy	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Altmire	Chaffetz	Gallely
Amash	Coble	Gardner
Austria	Coffman (CO)	Garrett
Bachmann	Cole	Gerlach
Bachus	Conaway	Gibbs
Barletta	Costa	Gingrey (GA)
Barrow	Costello	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Crawaack	Gonzalez
Benishek	Crawford	Goodlatte
Berg	Crenshaw	Gosar
Bilbray	Critz	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Granger
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Graves (MO)
Black	Denham	Green, Gene
Blackburn	Dent	Griffin (AR)
Bonner	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	Guinta
Boustany	Doyle	Guthrie
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hall
Braley (IA)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Buchanan	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Bucshon	Emerson	Hayworth
Buerkle	Farenthold	Heck
Burgess	Fattah	Hensarling
Burton (IN)	Fincher	Hergert
	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
	Flake	Hinojosa
	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
	Fleming	Hultgren
	Flores	Hunter

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1427

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 292, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—131

Adams	Black	Buerkle
Aderholt	Blackburn	Burgess
Akin	Brady (TX)	Burton (IN)
Amash	Brooks	Campbell
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Canseco
Benishek	Buchanan	Cantor
Bishop (UT)	Bucshon	Cassidy

Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman

Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson

McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberti
Tierney

Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)

NOES—296

Deutch
Giffords
Heinrich

NOT VOTING—8

Lujan
Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1434

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 296, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—127

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell

Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake

Fleming
Flores
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guinta
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmiere
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette

DeLauro
Dent
Kissell
Dicks
Lance
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastorell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed

NOT VOTING—8

Deutch
Giffords
Heinrich

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1438

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 273, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—149

Ackerman
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison

Engel
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Hoyer
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)

NOES—273

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Reyes
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wu
Yarmuth

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)
Deutch
Giffords

Heinrich
Hinchey
Holden

Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woodley
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert

NOES—274

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (IA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks

Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)

Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Kaptur
Rivera
Rivers
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1441

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 274, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—149

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Brooks (GA)
Buchanan
Crawford
Denham
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Burgess (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Guinta
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Herrera Beutler

Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Deutch
Giffords
Heinrich

Hinchev
Holden
Landry

Luján
Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1445

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WU

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 228, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

AYES—196

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

Cleaver
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach

Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Insllee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe y
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens

Pallone
Pastrell
Serrano (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—228

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Hall
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eilmers
Emerson
Farenthold

Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas

Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Coble
Conaway
Cravaack
Riviera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)

Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)

Walz (MN)
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Deutch
Giffords
Heinrich

Hinchev
Holden
Luján

Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LANDRY) (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1449

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 305, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

AYES—119

Akin
Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Hunter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach

Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Long
Luetkemeyer
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McClintock
McKinley
Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg

Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall

Yoder
Young (IN)

Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Rivera
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader

Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney

Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—305

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah

Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCullum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon

McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi

Deutch
Giffords
Heinrich

NOT VOTING—7

Hinchev
Holden
Lujan

Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1453

Mr. FATTAH changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 167, noes 257,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—167

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Altmire
Austria
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DesJarlais
Dicks
Doggett
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)

Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Manzullo
Matsui
McCullum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)

Akin
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conyers
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

NOES—257

Gallegly
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott

McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pompeo
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souterland
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)

Tipton Walz (MN) Womack
 Upton West Woodall
 Velázquez Westmoreland Woolsey
 Visclosky Whitfield Young (AK)
 Walberg Wilson (SC) Young (FL)
 Walden Wittman
 Walsh (IL) Wolf

Stark
 Thompson (CA)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas

Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters

Watt
 Waxman
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Womack
 Woodall
 Cummings
 Deutch
 Giffords
 Heinrich

Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)
 NOT VOTING—10
 Hinchey
 Holden
 Keating
 Luján
 Palazzo
 Pearce

NOT VOTING—7

Deutch Hinchey Pearce
 Giffords Holden
 Heinrich Luján

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1456

Ms. LEE changed her vote from
 “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from California (Mr.
 GARAMENDI) on which further pro-
 ceedings were postponed and on which
 the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 145, noes 276,
 not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—145

Ackerman Eshoo McGovern
 Andrews Farr McNerney
 Baca Fattah Michaud
 Baldwin Filner Miller, George
 Bartlett Frank (MA) Moore
 Bass (CA) Fudge Moran
 Bass (NH) Garamendi Nadler
 Becerra Grijalva Napolitano
 Berkley Gutierrez Neal
 Berman Hanabusa Olver
 Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL) Pallone
 Blumenauer Higgins Pascarell
 Boswell Himes Pastor (AZ)
 Brady (PA) Hirono Paul
 Braley (IA) Hochul Payne
 Brown (FL) Holt Pelosi
 Butterfield Honda Perlmutter
 Capps Hoyer Peters
 Capuano Inslee Pingree (ME)
 Cardoza Israel Polis
 Carnahan Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
 Carney Johnson (GA) Quigley
 Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. Rangel
 Castor (FL) Jones Reyes
 Chu Kaptur Richardson
 Cicilline Kildee Rothman (NJ)
 Clarke (MI) Kind Roybal-Allard
 Clarke (NY) Kucinich Rush
 Clyburn Langevin Sánchez, Linda
 Cohen Larsen (WA) T.
 Connolly (VA) Lee (CA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Conyers Levin Sarbanes
 Crowley Lewis (GA) Schakowsky
 Davis (CA) Loebsock Schiff
 Davis (IL) Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz
 DeFazio Lowey Scott (VA)
 DeGette Lynch Scott, David
 Dicks Maloney Serrano
 Dingell Markey Sherman
 Doggett Matsui Sires
 Edwards McCarthy (NY) Slaughter
 Ellison McCollum Smith (WA)
 Engel McDermott Speier

NOES—276

Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Amash
 Austria
 Bachman
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barrow
 Barton (TX)
 Benishek
 Berg
 Biggart
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canseco
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 DeLauro
 Denham
 Dent
 DeJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duffey
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach

Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinojosa
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Kelly
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lewis (CA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCard
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Mulvaney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1500

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 553
 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair-
 man, I move that the Committee do
 now rise.

The motion was agreed to.
 Accordingly, the Committee rose;
 and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.
 JOHNSON of Ohio) having assumed the
 chair, Mr. LANDRY, Acting Chair of the
 Committee of the Whole House on the
 State of the Union, reported that that
 Committee, having had under consider-
 ation the bill (H.R. 2354) making appro-
 priations for energy and water develop-
 ment and related agencies for the fiscal
 year ending September 30, 2012, and for
 other purposes, had come to no resolu-
 tion thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker,
 I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-
 bers may have 5 legislative days in
 which to revise and extend their re-
 marks and include extraneous material
 on H.R. 2354.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
 objection to the request of the gen-
 tleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT
 OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
 to House Resolution 340 and rule
 XVIII, the Chair declares the House in
 the Committee of the Whole House on
 the State of the Union for the further
 consideration of the bill, H.R. 1309.

□ 1503

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved
 itself into the Committee of the Whole
 House on the State of the Union for the
 further consideration of the bill (H.R.
 1309) to extend the authorization of the
 national flood insurance program, to
 achieve reforms to improve the finan-
 cial integrity and stability of the pro-
 gram, and to increase the role of pri-
 vate markets in the management of
 flood insurance risk, and for other pur-
 poses, with Mr. LANDRY (Acting Chair)
 in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Com-
 mittee of the Whole rose earlier today,
 all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1309

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 “Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extensions.
- Sec. 3. Mandatory purchase.
- Sec. 4. Reforms of coverage terms.
- Sec. 5. Reforms of premium rates.
- Sec. 6. Technical Mapping Advisory Council.
- Sec. 7. FEMA incorporation of new mapping protocols.
- Sec. 8. Treatment of levees.
- Sec. 9. Privatization initiatives.
- Sec. 10. FEMA annual report on insurance program.
- Sec. 11. Actuarial rates for severe repetitive loss properties refusing mitigation or purchase offers.
- Sec. 12. Mitigation assistance.
- Sec. 13. Grants for direct funding of mitigation activities for individual repetitive claims properties.
- Sec. 14. Notification to homeowners regarding mandatory purchase requirement applicability and rate phase-ins.
- Sec. 15. Notification of establishment of flood elevations.
- Sec. 16. Notification to tenants of availability of contents insurance.
- Sec. 17. Notification to policy holders regarding direct management of policy by FEMA.
- Sec. 18. Notice of availability of flood insurance and escrow in RESPA good faith estimate.
- Sec. 19. Reimbursement for costs incurred by homeowners obtaining letters of map amendment.
- Sec. 20. Treatment of swimming pool enclosures outside of hurricane season.
- Sec. 21. CDBG eligibility for flood insurance outreach activities and community building code administration grants.
- Sec. 22. Technical corrections.
- Sec. 23. Report on Write-Your-Own Program.
- Sec. 24. Studies of voluntary community-based flood insurance options.
- Sec. 25. Report on inclusion of building codes in floodplain management criteria.
- Sec. 26. Study on graduated risk.
- Sec. 27. No cause of action.

SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS.

(a) **EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.**—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking “September 30, 2011” and inserting “September 30, 2016”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF FINANCING.**—Section 1309(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2011” and inserting “September 30, 2016”.

SEC. 3. MANDATORY PURCHASE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) is

amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) **AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.**—

“(1) **FINDING BY ADMINISTRATOR THAT AREA IS AN ELIGIBLE AREA.**—For any area, upon a request submitted to the Administrator by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the area, the Administrator shall make a finding of whether the area is an eligible area under paragraph (3). If the Administrator finds that such area is an eligible area, the Administrator shall, in the discretion of the Administrator, designate a period during which such finding shall be effective, which shall not be longer in duration than 12 months.

“(2) **SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.**—If the Administrator makes a finding under paragraph (1) that an area is an eligible area under paragraph (3), during the period specified in the finding, the designation of such eligible area as an area having special flood hazards shall not be effective for purposes of subsection (a), (b), and (e) of this section, and section 202(a) of this Act. Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prevent any lender, servicer, regulated lending institution, Federal agency lender, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, at the discretion of such entity, from requiring the purchase of flood insurance coverage in connection with the making, increasing, extending, or renewing of a loan secured by improved real estate or a mobile home located or to be located in such eligible area during such period or a lender or servicer from purchasing coverage on behalf of a borrower pursuant to subsection (e).

“(3) **ELIGIBLE AREAS.**—An eligible area under this paragraph is an area that is designated or will, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in flood insurance maps that takes effect on or after the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, become designated as an area having special flood hazards and that meets any one of the following 3 requirements:

“(A) **AREAS WITH NO HISTORY OF SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARDS.**—The area does not include any area that has ever previously been designated as an area having special flood hazards.

“(B) **AREAS WITH FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS UNDER IMPROVEMENTS.**—The area was intended to be protected by a flood protection system—

“(i) that has been decertified, or is required to be certified, as providing protection for the 100-year frequency flood standard;

“(ii) that is being improved, constructed, or reconstructed; and

“(iii) for which the Administrator has determined measurable progress toward completion of such improvement, construction, reconstruction is being made and toward securing financial commitments sufficient to fund such completion.

“(C) **AREAS FOR WHICH APPEAL HAS BEEN FILED.**—An area for which a community has appealed—

“(i) designation of the area as having special flood hazards in a timely manner under section 1363; or

“(ii) any decertification or deaccreditation of a dam, levee, or other flood protection system or the level of protection afforded by a dam, levee, or system.

“(4) **EXTENSION OF DELAY.**—Upon a request submitted by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the eligible area, the Administrator may extend the period during which a finding under paragraph (1) shall be effective, except that—

“(A) each such extension under this paragraph shall not be for a period exceeding 12 months; and

“(B) for any area, the cumulative number of such extensions may not exceed 2.

“(5) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the applicability of a designation of any area as an area

having special flood hazards for purposes of the availability of flood insurance coverage, criteria for land management and use, notification of flood hazards, eligibility for mitigation assistance, or any other purpose or provision not specifically referred to in paragraph (2).

“(6) **REPORTS.**—The Administrator shall, in each annual report submitted pursuant to section 1320, include information identifying each finding under paragraph (1) by the Administrator during the preceding year that an area is an area having special flood hazards, the basis for each such finding, any extensions pursuant to paragraph (4) of the periods of effectiveness of such findings, and the reasons for such extensions.”.

(2) **NO REFUNDS.**—Nothing in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to authorize or require any payment or refund for flood insurance coverage purchased for any property that covered any period during which such coverage is not required for the property pursuant to the applicability of the amendment made by paragraph (1).

(b) **TERMINATION OF FORCE-PLACED INSURANCE.**—Section 102(e) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “insurance.” and inserting “insurance, including premiums or fees incurred for coverage beginning on the date on which flood insurance coverage lapsed or did not provide a sufficient coverage amount.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

“(3) **TERMINATION OF FORCE-PLACED INSURANCE.**—Within 30 days of receipt by the lender or servicer of a confirmation of a borrower’s existing flood insurance coverage, the lender or servicer shall—

“(A) terminate the force-placed insurance; and

“(B) refund to the borrower all force-placed insurance premiums paid by the borrower during any period during which the borrower’s flood insurance coverage and the force-placed flood insurance coverage were each in effect, and any related fees charged to the borrower with respect to the force-placed insurance during such period.

“(4) **SUFFICIENCY OF DEMONSTRATION.**—For purposes of confirming a borrower’s existing flood insurance coverage, a lender or servicer for a loan shall accept from the borrower an insurance policy declarations page that includes the existing flood insurance policy number and the identity of, and contact information for, the insurance company or agent.”.

(c) **USE OF PRIVATE INSURANCE TO SATISFY MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.**—Section 102(b) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “lending institutions not to make” and inserting “lending institutions—

“(A) not to make”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking “less.” and inserting “less; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) to accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under subparagraph (A) if the coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such subparagraph.”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “provided in paragraph (1).” the following new sentence: “Each Federal agency lender shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.”;

(3) in paragraph (3), in the matter following subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall accept private flood insurance as satisfaction of the flood insurance coverage requirement under the preceding sentence if the flood insurance coverage provided by such private flood insurance meets the requirements for coverage under such sentence.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) PRIVATE FLOOD INSURANCE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘private flood insurance’ means a contract for flood insurance coverage allowed for sale under the laws of any State.”

SEC. 4. REFORMS OF COVERAGE TERMS.

(a) MINIMUM DEDUCTIBLES FOR CLAIMS.—Section 1312 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4019) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Director is” and inserting the following: “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator is”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) MINIMUM ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLES.—

“(1) SUBSIDIZED RATE PROPERTIES.—For any structure that is covered by flood insurance under this title, and for which the chargeable rate for such coverage is less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such structure is located, the minimum annual deductible for damage to or loss of such structure shall be \$2,000.

“(2) ACTUARIAL RATE PROPERTIES.—For any structure that is covered by flood insurance under this title, for which the chargeable rate for such coverage is not less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such structure is located, the minimum annual deductible for damage to or loss of such structure shall be \$1,000.”

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL COVERAGE LIMITS.—Section 1306(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “in the case of any residential property” and inserting “in the case of any residential building designed for the occupancy of from one to four families”; and

(B) by striking “shall be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant for insurance so as to enable such insured or applicant to receive coverage up to a total amount (including such limits specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) of \$250,000” and inserting “shall be made available, with respect to any single such building, up to an aggregate liability (including such limits specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i)) of \$250,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “in the case of any nonresidential property, including churches,” and inserting “in the case of any nonresidential building, including a church.”; and

(B) by striking “shall be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant for insurance, in respect to any single structure, up to a total amount (including such limit specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as applicable) of \$500,000 for each structure and \$500,000 for any contents related to each structure” and inserting “shall be made available with respect to any single such building, up to an aggregate liability (including such limits specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), as applicable) of \$500,000, and coverage shall be made available up to a total of \$500,000 aggregate liability for contents owned by the building owner and \$500,000 aggregate liability for each unit within the building for contents owned by the tenant”.

(c) INDEXING OF MAXIMUM COVERAGE LIMITS.—Subsection (b) of section 1306 of the Na-

tional Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) each of the dollar amount limitations under paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) shall be adjusted effective on the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, such adjustments shall be calculated using the percentage change, over the period beginning on September 30, 1994, and ending on such date of enactment, in such inflationary index as the Administrator shall, by regulation, specify, and the dollar amount of such adjustment shall be rounded to the next lower dollar; and the Administrator shall cause to be published in the Federal Register the adjustments under this paragraph to such dollar amount limitations; except that in the case of coverage for a property that is made available, pursuant to this paragraph, in an amount that exceeds the limitation otherwise applicable to such coverage as specified in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6), the total of such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1).”

(d) OPTIONAL COVERAGE FOR LOSS OF USE OF PERSONAL RESIDENCE AND BUSINESS INTERRUPTION.—Subsection (b) of section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(b)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this section, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

“(5) the Administrator may provide that, in the case of any residential property, each renewal or new contract for flood insurance coverage may provide not more than \$5,000 aggregate liability per dwelling unit for any necessary increases in living expenses incurred by the insured when losses from a flood make the residence unfit to live in, except that—

“(A) purchase of such coverage shall be at the option of the insured;

“(B) any such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1); and

“(C) the Administrator may make such coverage available only if the Administrator makes a determination and causes notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register that—

“(i) a competitive private insurance market for such coverage does not exist; and

“(ii) the national flood insurance program has the capacity to make such coverage available without borrowing funds from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1309 or otherwise;

“(6) the Administrator may provide that, in the case of any commercial property or other residential property, including multifamily rental property, coverage for losses resulting from any partial or total interruption of the insured’s business caused by damage to, or loss of, such property from a flood may be made available to every insured upon renewal and every applicant, up to a total amount of \$20,000 per property, except that—

“(A) purchase of such coverage shall be at the option of the insured;

“(B) any such coverage shall be made available only at chargeable rates that are not less than the estimated premium rates for such coverage determined in accordance with section 1307(a)(1); and

“(C) the Administrator may make such coverage available only if the Administrator makes a determination and causes notice of such deter-

mination to be published in the Federal Register that—

“(i) a competitive private insurance market for such coverage does not exist; and

“(ii) the national flood insurance program has the capacity to make such coverage available without borrowing funds from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1309 or otherwise.”

(e) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS IN INSTALLMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—Section 1306 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS IN INSTALLMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—In addition to any other terms and conditions under subsection (a), such regulations shall provide that, in the case of any residential property, premiums for flood insurance coverage made available under this title for such property may be paid in installments.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—In implementing the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator may establish increased chargeable premium rates and surcharges, and deny coverage and establish such other sanctions, as the Administrator considers necessary to ensure that insureds purchase, pay for, and maintain coverage for the full term of a contract for flood insurance coverage or to prevent insureds from purchasing coverage only for periods during a year when risk of flooding is comparatively higher or canceling coverage for periods when such risk is comparatively lower.”

SEC. 5. REFORMS OF PREMIUM RATES.

(a) INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMITATION ON PREMIUM INCREASES.—Section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(e)) is amended by striking “10 percent” and inserting “20 percent”.

(b) PHASE-IN OF RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN NEWLY MAPPED AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “or notice” after “prescribe by regulation”;

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting “and subsection (g)” before the first comma; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) 5-YEAR PHASE-IN OF FLOOD INSURANCE RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN NEWLY MAPPED AREAS.—

“(1) 50 PERCENT RATE FOR INITIAL YEAR.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) or any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, in the case of any area that was not previously designated as an area having special flood hazards and that, pursuant to any issuance, revision, updating, or other change in flood insurance maps, becomes designated as such an area, during the 12-month period that begins, except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the date that such maps, as issued, revised, updated, or otherwise changed, become effective, the chargeable premium rate for flood insurance under this title with respect to any covered property that is located within such area shall be 50 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property.

“(2) APPLICABILITY TO PREFERRED RISK RATE AREAS.—In the case of any area described in paragraph (1) that consists of or includes an area that, as of date of the effectiveness of the flood insurance maps for such area referred to in paragraph (1) as so issued, revised, updated, or changed, is eligible for any reason for preferred risk rate method premiums for flood insurance coverage and was eligible for such premiums as of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (1) for such area eligible for preferred risk rate method premiums shall

begin upon the expiration of the period during which such area is eligible for such preferred risk rate method premiums.

“(3) PHASE-IN OF FULL ACTUARIAL RATES.—With respect to any area described in paragraph (1), upon the expiration of the 12-month period under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, for such area, the Administrator shall increase the chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance under this title for covered properties in such area by 20 percent, and by 20 percent upon the expiration of each successive 12-month period thereafter until the chargeable risk premium rates comply with subsection (c).

“(4) COVERED PROPERTIES.—For purposes of the subsection, the term ‘covered property’ means any residential property occupied by its owner or a bona fide tenant as a primary residence.”.

(2) REGULATION OR NOTICE.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall issue an interim final rule or notice to implement this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PHASE-IN OF ACTUARIAL RATES FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1308(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(c)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (7); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

“(2) COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.—Any nonresidential property.

“(3) SECOND HOMES AND VACATION HOMES.—Any residential property that is not the primary residence of any individual.

“(4) HOMES SOLD TO NEW OWNERS.—Any single family property that—

“(A) has been constructed or substantially improved and for which such construction or improvement was started, as determined by the Administrator, before December 31, 1974, or before the effective date of the initial rate map published by the Administrator under paragraph (2) of section 1360(a) for the area in which such property is located, whichever is later; and

“(B) is purchased after the effective date of this paragraph, pursuant to section 5(c)(3)(A) of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011.

“(5) HOMES DAMAGED OR IMPROVED.—Any property that, on or after the date of the enactment of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011, has experienced or sustained—

“(A) substantial flood damage exceeding 50 percent of the fair market value of such property; or

“(B) substantial improvement exceeding 30 percent of the fair market value of such property.

“(6) HOMES WITH MULTIPLE CLAIMS.—Any severe repetitive loss property (as such term is defined in section 1361A(b)).”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 1308 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the limitations provided under paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “subsection (e)”; and

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking “, except” and all that follows through “subsection (e)”; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking “paragraph (2) or (3)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”.
 (3) EFFECTIVE DATE AND TRANSITION.—

(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply beginning upon the expiration of the 12-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

(B) TRANSITION FOR PROPERTIES COVERED BY FLOOD INSURANCE UPON EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(i) INCREASE OF RATES OVER TIME.—In the case of any property described in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of section 1308(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, that, as of the effective date under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, is covered under a policy for flood insurance made available under the national flood insurance program for which the chargeable premium rates are less than the applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1) of such Act for the area in which the property is located, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall increase the chargeable premium rates for such property over time to such applicable estimated risk premium rate under section 1307(a)(1).

(ii) AMOUNT OF ANNUAL INCREASE.—Such increase shall be made by increasing the chargeable premium rates for the property (after application of any increase in the premium rates otherwise applicable to such property), once during the 12-month period that begins upon the effective date under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and once every 12 months thereafter until such increase is accomplished, by 20 percent (or such lesser amount as may be necessary so that the chargeable rate does not exceed such applicable estimated risk premium rate or to comply with clause (iii)).

(iii) PROPERTIES SUBJECT TO PHASE-IN AND ANNUAL INCREASES.—In the case of any pre-FIRM property (as such term is defined in section 578(b) of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1974), the aggregate increase, during any 12-month period, in the chargeable premium rate for the property that is attributable to this subparagraph or to an increase described in section 1308(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 may not exceed 20 percent.

(iv) FULL ACTUARIAL RATES.—The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of such section 1308(c) shall apply to such a property upon the accomplishment of the increase under this subparagraph and thereafter.

(d) PROHIBITION OF EXTENSION OF SUBSIDIZED RATES TO LAPSED POLICIES.—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—

(1) in subsection (e), by inserting “or subsection (h)” after “subsection (c)”;
 (2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) PROHIBITION OF EXTENSION OF SUBSIDIZED RATES TO LAPSED POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, the Administrator shall not provide flood insurance coverage under this title for any property for which a policy for such coverage for the property has previously lapsed in coverage as a result of the deliberate choice of the holder of such policy, at a rate less than the applicable estimated risk premium rates for the area (or subdivision thereof) in which such property is located.”.

(e) RECOGNITION OF STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS IN DETERMINATION OF RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1307 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—
 (i) in the first sentence, by striking “construction of a flood protection system” and inserting “construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system (without respect to the level of Federal investment or participation)”; and
 (ii) in the second sentence—
 (1) by striking “construction of a flood protection system” and inserting “construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system”; and
 (2) by inserting “based on the present value of the completed system” after “has been expended”; and

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in the first sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(without respect to the level of Federal investment or participation)” before the period at the end;

(ii) in the third sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, whether coastal or riverine,” after “special flood hazard”; and

(iii) in paragraph (1), by striking “a Federal agency in consultation with the local project sponsor” and inserting “the entity or entities that own, operate, maintain, or repair such system”.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall promulgate regulations to implement this subsection and the amendments made by this subsection as soon as practicable, but not more than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Paragraph (3) may not be construed to annul, alter, affect, authorize any waiver of, or establish any exception to, the requirement under the preceding sentence.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL MAPPING ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a council to be known as the Technical Mapping Advisory Council (in this section referred to as the “Council”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall consist of—

(A) the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the “Administrator”), or the designee thereof;

(B) the Director of the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, or the designee thereof;

(C) the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, or the designee thereof;

(D) the commanding officer of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, or the designee thereof;

(E) the chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, or the designee thereof;

(F) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, or the designee thereof;

(G) the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, or the designee thereof; and

(H) 14 additional members to be appointed by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, who shall be—

(i) an expert in data management;

(ii) an expert in real estate;

(iii) an expert in insurance;

(iv) a member of a recognized regional flood and storm water management organization;

(v) a representative of a State emergency management agency or association or organization for such agencies;

(vi) a member of a recognized professional surveying association or organization;

(vii) a member of a recognized professional mapping association or organization;

(viii) a member of a recognized professional engineering association or organization;

(ix) a member of a recognized professional association or organization representing flood hazard determination firms;

(x) a representative of State national flood insurance coordination offices;

(xi) representatives of two local governments, at least one of whom is a local levee flood manager or executive, designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as Cooperating Technical Partners; and

(xii) representatives of two State governments designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as Cooperating Technical States.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members of the Council shall be appointed based on their demonstrated

knowledge and competence regarding surveying, cartography, remote sensing, geographic information systems, or the technical aspects of preparing and using flood insurance rate maps. In appointing members under paragraph (1)(I), the Administrator shall ensure that the membership of the Council has a balance of Federal, State, local, and private members.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) NEW MAPPING STANDARDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall develop and submit to the Administrator and the Congress proposed new mapping standards for 100-year flood insurance rate maps used under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. In developing such proposed standards the Council shall—

(A) ensure that the flood insurance rate maps reflect true risk, including graduated risk that better reflects the financial risk to each property; such reflection of risk should be at the smallest geographic level possible (but not necessarily property-by-property) to ensure that communities are mapped in a manner that takes into consideration different risk levels within the community;

(B) ensure the most efficient generation, display, and distribution of flood risk data, models, and maps where practicable through dynamic digital environments using spatial database technology and the Internet;

(C) ensure that flood insurance rate maps reflect current hydrologic and hydraulic data, current land use, and topography, incorporating the most current and accurate ground and bathymetric elevation data;

(D) determine the best ways to include in such flood insurance rate maps levees, decertified levees, and areas located below dams, including determining a methodology for ensuring that decertified levees and other protections are included in flood insurance rate maps and their corresponding flood zones reflect the level of protection conferred;

(E) consider how to incorporate restored wetlands and other natural buffers into flood insurance rate maps, which may include wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, erosion zones, meander belts, endangered species habitat, barrier islands and shoreline buffer features, riparian forests, and other features;

(F) consider whether to use vertical positioning (as defined by the Administrator) for flood insurance rate maps;

(G) ensure that flood insurance rate maps differentiate between a property that is located in a flood zone and a structure located on such property that is not at the same risk level for flooding as such property due to the elevation of the structure;

(H) ensure that flood insurance rate maps take into consideration the best scientific data and potential future conditions (including projections for sea level rise); and

(I) consider how to incorporate the new standards proposed pursuant to this paragraph in existing mapping efforts.

(2) ONGOING DUTIES.—The Council shall, on an ongoing basis, review the mapping protocols developed pursuant to paragraph (1), and make recommendations to the Administrator when the Council determines that mapping protocols should be altered.

(3) MEETINGS.—In carrying out its duties under this section, the Council shall consult with stakeholders through at least 4 public meetings annually, and shall seek input of all stakeholder interests including State and local representatives, environmental and conservation organizations, insurance industry representatives, advocacy groups, planning organizations, and mapping organizations.

(d) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall receive no additional compensation by reason of their service on the Council.

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Administrator shall serve as the Chairperson of the Council.

(f) STAFF.—

(1) FEMA.—Upon the request of the Council, the Administrator may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, personnel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to assist the Council in carrying out its duties.

(2) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Council, any other Federal agency that is a member of the Council may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, personnel to assist the Council in carrying out its duties.

(g) POWERS.—In carrying out this section, the Council may hold hearings, receive evidence and assistance, provide information, and conduct research, as the Council considers appropriate.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Council shall terminate upon the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. FEMA INCORPORATION OF NEW MAPPING PROTOCOLS.

(a) NEW RATE MAPPING STANDARDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon submission by the Technical Mapping Advisory Council under section 6 of the proposed new mapping standards for flood insurance rate maps used under the national flood insurance program developed by the Council pursuant to section 6(c), the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the “Administrator”) shall establish new standards for such rate maps based on such proposed new standards and the recommendations of the Council.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The new standards for flood insurance rate maps established by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) delineate and include in any such rate maps—

(A) all areas located within the 100-year flood plain;

(B) areas of residual risk, including areas behind levees, dams, and other man-made structures; and

(C) areas subject to graduated and other risk levels, to the maximum extent possible;

(2) ensure that any such rate maps—

(A) include levees, including decertified levees, and the level of protection they confer;

(B) reflect current land use and topography and incorporate the most current and accurate ground level data;

(C) take into consideration the impacts and use of fill and the flood risks associated with altered hydrology;

(D) differentiate between a property that is located in a flood zone and a structure located on such property that is not at the same risk level for flooding as such property due to the elevation of the structure;

(E) identify and incorporate natural features and their associated flood protection benefits into mapping and rates; and

(F) identify, analyze, and incorporate the impact of significant changes to building and development throughout any river or coastal water system, including all tributaries, which may impact flooding in areas downstream; and

(3) provide that such rate maps are developed on a watershed basis.

(c) REPORT.—If, in establishing new standards for flood insurance rate maps pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator does not implement all of the recommendations of the Council made under the proposed new mapping standards developed by the Council pursuant to section 6(c), upon establishment of the new standards the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate specifying which such recommendations were not adopted and explaining the reasons such recommendations were not adopted.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall, not later than the expiration of the 6-

month period beginning upon establishment of the new standards for flood insurance rate maps pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, commence use of the new standards and updating of flood insurance rate maps in accordance with the new standards. Not later than the expiration of the 5-year period beginning upon the establishment of such new standards, the Administrator shall complete updating of all flood insurance rate maps in accordance with the new standards, subject to the availability of sufficient amounts for such activities provided in appropriation Acts.

(e) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN PROPERTIES.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF ELEVATION CERTIFICATE.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, subsections (a), (b), and (e) of section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a), and section 202(a) of such Act, shall not apply to a property located in an area designated as having a special flood hazard if the owner of such property submits to the Administrator an elevation certificate for such property showing that the lowest level of the primary residence on such property is at an elevation that is at least three feet higher than the elevation of the 100-year flood plain.

(2) REVIEW OF SURVEY.—The Administrator shall accept as conclusive each elevation survey submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator conducts a subsequent elevation survey and determines that the lowest level of the primary residence on the property in question is not at an elevation that is at least three feet higher than the elevation of the 100-year flood plain. The Administrator shall provide any such subsequent elevation survey to the owner of such property.

(3) DETERMINATIONS FOR PROPERTIES ON BORDERS OF SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS.—

(A) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—In the case of any survey for a property submitted to the Administrator pursuant to paragraph (1) showing that a portion of the property is located within an area having special flood hazards and that a structure located on the property is not located within such area having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall expeditiously process any request made by an owner of the property for a determination pursuant to paragraph (2) or a determination of whether the structure is located within the area having special flood hazards.

(B) PROHIBITION OF FEE.—If the Administrator determines pursuant to subparagraph (A) that the structure on the property is not located within the area having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall not charge a fee for reviewing the flood hazard data and shall not require the owner to provide any additional elevation data.

(C) SIMPLIFICATION OF REVIEW PROCESS.—The Administrator shall collaborate with private sector flood insurers to simplify the review process for properties described in subparagraph (A) and to ensure that the review process provides for accurate determinations.

(4) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—This subsection shall cease to apply to a property on the date on which the Administrator updates the flood insurance rate map that applies to such property in accordance with the requirements of subsection (d).

SEC. 8. TREATMENT OF LEVEES.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) TREATMENT OF LEVEES.—The Administrator may not issue flood insurance maps, or make effective updated flood insurance maps, that omit or disregard the actual protection afforded by an existing levee, floodwall, pump or other flood protection feature, regardless of the accreditation status of such feature.”.

SEC. 9. PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVES.

(a) **FEMA AND GAO REPORTS.**—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess a broad range of options, methods, and strategies for privatizing the national flood insurance program and shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate with recommendations for the best manner to accomplish such privatization.

(b) PRIVATE RISK-MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may carry out such private risk-management initiatives under the national flood insurance program as the Administrator considers appropriate to determine the capacity of private insurers, reinsurers, and financial markets to assist communities, on a voluntary basis only, in managing the full range of financial risks associated with flooding.

(2) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall assess the capacity of the private reinsurance, capital, and financial markets by seeking proposals to assume a portion of the program's insurance risk and submit to the Congress a report describing the response to such request for proposals and the results of such assessment.

(3) **PROTOCOL FOR RELEASE OF DATA.**—The Administrator shall develop a protocol to provide for the release of data sufficient to conduct the assessment required under paragraph (2).

(c) **REINSURANCE.**—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 1331(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4051(a)(2)), by inserting “, including as reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the flood insurance program” before “, on such terms”;

(2) in section 1332(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 4052(c)(2)), by inserting “or reinsurance” after “flood insurance coverage”;

(3) in section 1335(a) (42 U.S.C. 4055(a))—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The Administrator is authorized to secure reinsurance coverage of coverage provided by the flood insurance program from private market insurance, reinsurance, and capital market sources 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 and that minimizes the likelihood that the program will utilize the borrowing authority provided under section 1309.”;

(4) in section 1346(a) (12 U.S.C. 4082(a))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, or for purposes of securing reinsurance of insurance coverage provided by the program,” before “of any or all of”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “estimating” and inserting “Estimating”; and

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

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “receiving” and inserting “Receiving”; and

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

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “making” and inserting “Making”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a period;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “otherwise” and inserting “Otherwise”; and

(ii) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (5); and

(F) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) Placing reinsurance coverage on insurance provided by such program.”; and

(5) in section 1370(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4121(a)(3)), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, is subject to the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)), or is authorized by the Administrator to assume reinsurance on risks insured by the flood insurance program”.

(d) **ASSESSMENT OF CLAIMS-PAYING ABILITY.**—

(1) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct an assessment of the claims-paying ability of the national flood insurance program, including the program's utilization of private sector reinsurance and reinsurance equivalents, with and without reliance on borrowing authority under section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016). In conducting the assessment, the Administrator shall take into consideration regional concentrations of coverage written by the program, peak flood zones, and relevant mitigation measures.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress of the results of each such assessment, and make such report available to the public, not later than 30 days after completion of the assessment.

SEC. 10. FEMA ANNUAL REPORT ON INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 1320 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4027) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT” and inserting “ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “biennially”;

(B) by striking “the President for submission to”; and

(C) by inserting “not later than June 30 of each year” before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “biennial” and inserting “annual”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **FINANCIAL STATUS OF PROGRAM.**—The report under this section for each year shall include information regarding the financial status of the national flood insurance program under this title, including a description of the financial status of the National Flood Insurance Fund and current and projected levels of claims, premium receipts, expenses, and borrowing under the program.”.

SEC. 11. ACTUARIAL RATES FOR SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES REFUSING MITIGATION OR PURCHASE OFFERS.

Subsection (h) of section 1361A of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4102a(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “150 percent” and all that follows through “paragraph (3)” and inserting “the applicable estimated risk premium rate for such coverage for the area (or subdivision thereof) determined in accordance with section 1307(a), subject to phase-in of such rates in the same manner provided under paragraph (2) of section 1308(g) for properties described in paragraph (1) of such section”; and

(B) by inserting after and below subparagraph (B) the following:

“An offer to take action under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) shall be considered to be made for purposes of this paragraph with respect to a severe repetitive loss property regardless of the time that the offer was made and regardless of whether the Administrator has transferred financial assistance under this section to the State or community making the offer for funding such action, but only if the owner of the property is provided a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 15 days, to respond to the offer.”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

SEC. 12. MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.

Subsection (e) of section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) **ELIGIBILITY OF DEMOLITION AND REBUILDING OF PROPERTIES.**—The Administrator shall consider as an eligible activity the demolition and rebuilding of properties to at least base flood levels or higher, if required by the Administrator or if required by any State or local ordinance, and in accordance with project implementation criteria established by the Administrator.”.

SEC. 13. GRANTS FOR DIRECT FUNDING OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FOR INDIVIDUAL REPETITIVE CLAIMS PROPERTIES.

(a) **DIRECT GRANTS TO OWNERS.**—Section 1323 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4030) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “DIRECT” before “GRANTS”; and

(2) in subsection (a), in the the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “, to owners of such properties,” before “for mitigation actions”; and

(B) by striking “1” and inserting “two”.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Paragraph (9) of section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended by inserting “which shall remain available until expended,” after “any fiscal year.”.

SEC. 14. NOTIFICATION TO HOMEOWNERS REGARDING MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT APPLICABILITY AND RATE PHASE-INS.

Section 201 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4105) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **ANNUAL NOTIFICATION.**—The Administrator, in consultation with affected communities, shall establish and carry out a plan to notify residents of areas having special flood hazards, on an annual basis—

“(1) that they reside in such an area;

“(2) of the geographical boundaries of such area;

“(3) of whether section 1308(h) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 applies to properties within such area;

“(4) of the provisions of section 102 requiring purchase of flood insurance coverage for properties located in such an area, including the date on which such provisions apply with respect to such area, taking into consideration section 102(i); and

“(5) of a general estimate of what similar homeowners in similar areas typically pay for flood insurance coverage, taking into consideration section 1308(g) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968.”.

SEC. 15. NOTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOD ELEVATIONS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(l) **NOTIFICATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF MAP MODERNIZATION.**—Upon any revision or update of any floodplain area or flood-risk zone pursuant to subsection (f), any decision pursuant to subsection (f)(1) that such revision or update is necessary, any issuance of preliminary maps for such revision or updating, or any other significant action relating to any such revision or update, the Administrator shall notify the Senators for each State affected, and each Member of the House of Representatives for each congressional district affected, by such revision or update in writing of the action taken.”.

SEC. 16. NOTIFICATION TO TENANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF CONTENTS INSURANCE.

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after section 1308 (42 U.S.C. 4015) the following new section:

“SEC. 1308A. NOTIFICATION TO TENANTS OF AVAILABILITY OF CONTENTS INSURANCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, upon entering into a contract for flood insurance coverage under this title for any property—

“(1) provide to the insured sufficient copies of the notice developed pursuant to subsection (b); and

“(2) require the insured to provide a copy of the notice, or otherwise provide notification of the information under subsection (b) in the manner that the manager or landlord deems most appropriate, to each such tenant and to each new tenant upon commencement of such a tenancy.

“(b) NOTICE.—Notice to a tenant of a property in accordance with this subsection is written notice that clearly informs a tenant—

“(1) whether the property is located in an area having special flood hazards;

“(2) that flood insurance coverage is available under the national flood insurance program under this title for contents of the unit or structure leased by the tenant;

“(3) of the maximum amount of such coverage for contents available under this title at that time; and

“(4) of where to obtain information regarding how to obtain such coverage, including a telephone number, mailing address, and Internet site of the Administrator where such information is available.”

SEC. 17. NOTIFICATION TO POLICY HOLDERS REGARDING DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF POLICY BY FEMA.

Part C of chapter II of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1349. NOTIFICATION TO POLICY HOLDERS REGARDING DIRECT MANAGEMENT OF POLICY BY FEMA.

“(a) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days before the date on which a transferred flood insurance policy expires, and annually thereafter until such time as the Federal Emergency Management Agency is no longer directly administering such policy, the Administrator shall notify the holder of such policy that—

“(1) the Federal Emergency Management Agency is directly administering the policy;

“(2) such holder may purchase flood insurance that is directly administered by an insurance company; and

“(3) purchasing flood insurance offered under the National Flood Insurance Program that is directly administered by an insurance company will not alter the coverage provided or the premiums charged to such holder that otherwise would be provided or charged if the policy was directly administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘transferred flood insurance policy’ means a flood insurance policy that—

“(1) was directly administered by an insurance company at the time the policy was originally purchased by the policy holder; and

“(2) at the time of renewal of the policy, direct administration of the policy was or will be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.”

SEC. 18. NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF FLOOD INSURANCE AND ESCROW IN RESPA GOOD FAITH ESTIMATE.

Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Each such good faith estimate shall include the following conspicuous statements and information: (1) that flood insurance coverage for residential real estate is generally available under the national flood insurance program whether or not the real estate is located in an area having special flood hazards and that, to obtain such coverage, a home

owner or purchaser should contact the national flood insurance program; (2) a telephone number and a location on the Internet by which a home owner or purchaser can contact the national flood insurance program; and (3) that the escrowing of flood insurance payments is required for many loans under section 102(d) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, and may be a convenient and available option with respect to other loans.”

SEC. 19. REIMBURSEMENT FOR COSTS INCURRED BY HOMEOWNERS OBTAINING LETTERS OF MAP AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT UPON BONA FIDE OFFER.—If an owner of any property located in an area described in section 102(i)(3) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 obtains a letter of map amendment due to a bona fide error on the part of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Administrator shall reimburse such owner, or such entity or jurisdiction acting on such owner’s behalf, for any reasonable costs incurred in obtaining such letter.

“(2) REASONABLE COSTS.—The Administrator shall, by regulation or notice, determine a reasonable amount of costs to be reimbursed under paragraph (1), except that such costs shall not include legal or attorneys fees. In determining the reasonableness of costs, the Administrator shall only consider the actual costs to the owner of utilizing the services of an engineer, surveyor, or similar services.”

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall issue the regulations or notice required under section 1360(m)(2) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as added by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 20. TREATMENT OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF HURRICANE SEASON.

Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1325. TREATMENT OF SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF HURRICANE SEASON.

“In the case of any property that is otherwise in compliance with the coverage and building requirements of the national flood insurance program, the presence of an enclosed swimming pool located at ground level or in the space below the lowest floor of a building after November 30 and before June 1 of any year shall have no effect on the terms of coverage or the ability to receive coverage for such building under the national flood insurance program established pursuant to this title, if the pool is enclosed with non-supporting breakaway walls.”

SEC. 21. CDBG ELIGIBILITY FOR FLOOD INSURANCE OUTREACH ACTIVITIES AND COMMUNITY BUILDING CODE ADMINISTRATION GRANTS.

Section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (25), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(26) supplementing existing State or local funding for administration of building code enforcement by local building code enforcement departments, including for increasing staffing, providing staff training, increasing staff competence and professional qualifications, and supporting individual certification or departmental accreditation, and for capital expendi-

tures specifically dedicated to the administration of the building code enforcement department, except that, to be eligible to use amounts as provided in this paragraph—

“(A) a building code enforcement department shall provide matching, non-Federal funds to be used in conjunction with amounts used under this paragraph in an amount—

“(i) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of more than 50,000, equal to not less than 50 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph;

“(ii) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of between 20,001 and 50,000, equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph; and

“(iii) in the case of a building code enforcement department serving an area with a population of less than 20,000, equal to not less than 12.5 percent of the total amount of any funds made available under this title that are used under this paragraph;

except that the Secretary may waive the matching fund requirements under this subparagraph, in whole or in part, based upon the level of economic distress of the jurisdiction in which is located the local building code enforcement department that is using amounts for purposes under this paragraph, and shall waive such matching fund requirements in whole for any recipient jurisdiction that has dedicated all building code permitting fees to the conduct of local building code enforcement; and

“(B) any building code enforcement department using funds made available under this title for purposes under this paragraph shall empanel a code administration and enforcement team consisting of at least 1 full-time building code enforcement officer, a city planner, and a health planner or similar officer; and

“(27) provision of assistance to local governmental agencies responsible for floodplain management activities (including such agencies of Indians tribes, as such term is defined in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103)) in communities that participate in the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), only for carrying out outreach activities to encourage and facilitate the purchase of flood insurance protection under such Act by owners and renters of properties in such communities and to promote educational activities that increase awareness of flood risk reduction; except that—

“(A) amounts used as provided under this paragraph shall be used only for activities designed to—

“(i) identify owners and renters of properties in communities that participate in the national flood insurance program, including owners of residential and commercial properties;

“(ii) notify such owners and renters when their properties become included in, or when they are excluded from, an area having special flood hazards and the effect of such inclusion or exclusion on the applicability of the mandatory flood insurance purchase requirement under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) to such properties;

“(iii) educate such owners and renters regarding the flood risk and reduction of this risk in their community, including the continued flood risks to areas that are no longer subject to the flood insurance mandatory purchase requirement;

“(iv) educate such owners and renters regarding the benefits and costs of maintaining or acquiring flood insurance, including, where applicable, lower-cost preferred risk policies under this title for such properties and the contents of such properties;

“(v) encourage such owners and renters to maintain or acquire such coverage;

“(vi) notify such owners of where to obtain information regarding how to obtain such coverage, including a telephone number, mailing address, and Internet site of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this paragraph referred to as the ‘Administrator’) where such information is available; and

“(vii) educate local real estate agents in communities participating in the national flood insurance program regarding the program and the availability of coverage under the program for owners and renters of properties in such communities, and establish coordination and liaisons with such real estate agents to facilitate purchase of coverage under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and increase awareness of flood risk reduction;

“(B) in any fiscal year, a local governmental agency may not use an amount under this paragraph that exceeds 3 times the amount that the agency certifies, as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall require, that the agency will contribute from non-Federal funds to be used with such amounts used under this paragraph only for carrying out activities described in subparagraph (A); and for purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘non-Federal funds’ includes State or local government agency amounts, in-kind contributions, any salary paid to staff to carry out the eligible activities of the local governmental agency involved, the value of the time and services contributed by volunteers to carry out such services (at a rate determined by the Secretary), and the value of any donated material or building and the value of any lease on a building;

“(C) a local governmental agency that uses amounts as provided under this paragraph may coordinate or contract with other agencies and entities having particular capacities, specialties, or experience with respect to certain populations or constituencies, including elderly or disabled families or persons, to carry out activities described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such populations or constituencies; and

“(D) each local governmental agency that uses amounts as provided under this paragraph shall submit a report to the Secretary and the Administrator, not later than 12 months after such amounts are first received, which shall include such information as the Secretary and the Administrator jointly consider appropriate to describe the activities conducted using such amounts and the effect of such activities on the retention or acquisition of flood insurance coverage.”

SEC. 22. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973.—The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4002 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking “Director” each place such term appears, except in section 102(f)(3) (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(3)), and inserting “Administrator”; and

(2) in section 201(b) (42 U.S.C. 4105(b)), by striking “Director’s” and inserting “Administrator’s”.

(b) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking “Director” each place such term appears and inserting “Administrator”; and

(2) in sections 1363 (42 U.S.C. 4104), by striking “Director’s” each place such term appears and inserting “Administrator’s”.

(c) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956.—Section 15(e) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414(e)) is amended by striking “Director” each place such term appears and inserting “Administrator”.

SEC. 23. REPORT ON WRITE-YOUR-OWN PROGRAM.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the

Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to Congress a report describing procedures and policies that the Administrator can implement to limit the percentage of flood insurance policies directly managed by the Agency to not more than 10 percent, if possible, of all flood insurance policies issued in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program.

SEC. 24. STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDIES.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each conduct a separate study to assess options, methods, and strategies for offering voluntary community-based flood insurance policy options and incorporating such options into the national flood insurance program. Such studies shall take into consideration and analyze how the policy options would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Comptroller General of the United States shall each submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on the results and conclusions of the study such agency conducted under subsection (a), and each such report shall include recommendations for the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance options into the national flood insurance program and for a strategy to implement such options that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities.

SEC. 25. REPORT ON INCLUSION OF BUILDING CODES IN FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT CRITERIA.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate regarding the impact, effectiveness, and feasibility of amending section 1361 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4102) to include widely used and nationally recognized building codes as part of the floodplain management criteria developed under such section, and shall determine—

(1) the regulatory, financial, and economic impacts of such a building code requirement on homeowners, States and local communities, local land use policies, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(2) the resources required of State and local communities to administer and enforce such a building code requirement;

(3) the effectiveness of such a building code requirement in reducing flood-related damage to buildings and contents;

(4) the impact of such a building code requirement on the actuarial soundness of the National Flood Insurance Program;

(5) the effectiveness of nationally recognized codes in allowing innovative materials and systems for flood-resistant construction;

(6) the feasibility and effectiveness of providing an incentive in lower premium rates for flood insurance coverage under such Act for structures meeting whichever of such widely used and nationally recognized building code or any applicable local building code provides greater protection from flood damage;

(7) the impact of such a building code requirement on rural communities with different building code challenges than more urban environments; and

(8) the impact of such a building code requirement on Indian reservations.

SEC. 26. STUDY ON GRADUATED RISK.

(a) STUDY.—The National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a study exploring methods for understanding graduated risk behind levees and the associated land development, insurance, and risk communication dimensions, which shall—

(1) research, review, and recommend current best practices for estimating direct annualized flood losses behind levees for residential and commercial structures;

(2) rank such practices based on their best value, balancing cost, scientific integrity, and the inherent uncertainties associated with all aspects of the loss estimate, including geotechnical engineering, flood frequency estimates, economic value, and direct damages;

(3) research, review, and identify current best floodplain management and land use practices behind levees that effectively balance social, economic, and environmental considerations as part of an overall flood risk management strategy;

(4) identify examples where such practices have proven effective and recommend methods and processes by which they could be applied more broadly across the United States, given the variety of different flood risks, State and local legal frameworks, and evolving judicial opinions;

(5) research, review, and identify a variety of flood insurance pricing options for flood hazards behind levees which are actuarially sound and based on the flood risk data developed using the top three best value approaches identified pursuant to paragraph (1);

(6) evaluate and recommend methods to reduce insurance costs through creative arrangements between insureds and insurers while keeping a clear accounting of how much financial risk is being borne by various parties such that the entire risk is accounted for, including establishment of explicit limits on disaster aid or other assistance in the event of a flood; and

(7) taking into consideration the recommendations pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (3), recommend approaches to communicating the associated risks to community officials, homeowners, and other residents.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit a report to the Committees on Financial Services and Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate on the study under subsection (a) including the information and recommendations required under such subsection.

SEC. 27. NO CAUSE OF ACTION.

No cause of action shall exist and no claim may be brought against the United States for violation of any notification requirement imposed upon the United States by this Act or any amendment made by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112-138, and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 340. Each amendment printed in the report may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or his designee to offer

amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 340, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendments numbered 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 22, and 24 printed in House Report 112-138 offered by Mrs. BIGGERT:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

Page 38, line 23, strike "5-year" and insert "10-year".

Page 39, line 18 strike "SURVEY" and insert "CERTIFICATE".

Page 39, line 19 strike "survey" and insert "certificate".

Page 50, line 7, strike "1308(h)" and insert "1308(g)".

Page 50, lines 20 and 21 strike "OF ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOD ELEVATIONS" and insert "TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF FLOOD MAP REVISIONS AND UPDATES".

Page 55, line 11, strike "OFFER" and insert "ERROR".

Page 64, line 16, strike "sections" and insert "section".

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI

Page 20, line 3, strike "50 PERCENT RATE FOR INITIAL YEAR" and insert "5-YEAR PHASE-IN PERIOD".

Page 20, line 11, strike "12-month period" and insert "5-year period".

Page 20, lines 17 through 19, strike "50 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property" and insert "the rate described in paragraph (3)".

Page 21, line 4, strike "12-month period" and insert "5-year period".

Page 21, strike lines 11 through 18, and insert the following:

"the chargeable risk premium rate for flood insurance under this title for a covered property that is located in such area shall be—

"(A) for the first year of the 5-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the greater of—

"(i) 20 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property; and

"(ii) in the case of any property that, as of the beginning of such first year, is eligible for preferred risk rate method premiums for flood insurance coverage, such preferred risk rate method premium for the property;

"(B) for the second year of such 5-year period, 40 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property;

"(C) for the third year of such 5-year period, 60 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property;

"(D) for the fourth year of such 5-year period, 80 percent of the chargeable risk pre-

mium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property; and

"(E) for the fifth year of such 5-year period, 100 percent of the chargeable risk premium rate otherwise applicable under this title to the property.".

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

Page 19, after line 8, insert the following new subsection:

(F) EFFECTIVE DATE OF POLICIES COVERING PROPERTIES AFFECTED BY FLOODS IN PROGRESS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1306(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4013(c)) is amended by adding after the period at the end the following: "With respect to any flood that has commenced or is in progress before the expiration of such 30-day period, such flood insurance coverage for a property shall take effect upon the expiration of such 30-day period and shall cover damage to such property occurring after the expiration of such period that results from such flood, but only if the property has not suffered damage or loss as a result of such flood before the expiration of such 30-day period.".

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Page 23, line 17, strike "section 1361A(b)" and insert "section 1366(j)".

Strike line 10 on page 47 and all that follows through page 48, line 15.

Strike line 16 on page 48 and all that follows through page 49, line 19 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: "Such financial assistance shall be made available—

"(1) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities;

"(2) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to severe repetitive loss structures; and

"(3) to property owners in the form of direct grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to individual structures for which 2 or more claim payments for losses have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title if the Administrator, after consultation with the State and community, determines that neither the State nor community in which such a structure is located has the capacity to manage such grants.".

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(A) by striking "flood risk" and inserting "multi-hazard";

(B) by striking "provides protection against" and inserting "examines reduction of"; and

(C) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (b);

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(1) REQUIREMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH APPROVED MITIGATION PLAN.—Amounts provided under this section may be used only for mitigation activities that are consistent with mitigation plans that are approved by the Administrator and identified under subparagraph (4).";

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) REQUIREMENTS OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY, COST EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEREST OF

NFIF.—The Administrator may approve only mitigation activities that the Administrator determines are technically feasible and cost-effective and in the interest of, and represent savings to, the National Flood Insurance Fund. In making such determinations, the Administrator shall take into consideration recognized benefits that are difficult to quantify.

"(3) PRIORITY FOR MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.—In providing grants under this section for mitigation activities, the Administrator shall give priority for funding to activities that the Administrator determines will result in the greatest savings to the National Flood Insurance Fund, including activities for—

"(A) severe repetitive loss structures;

"(B) repetitive loss structures; and

"(C) other subsets of structures as the Administrator may establish.";

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking all of the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(4) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Eligible activities may include—";

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (H);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (F), (H), and (I);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) demolition and rebuilding of properties to at least base flood elevation or greater, if required by the Administrator or if required by any State regulation or local ordinance, and in accordance with criteria established by the Administrator;

"(E) elevation, relocation, and floodproofing of utilities (including equipment that serve structures);";

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (F), as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following new subparagraph:

"(G) the development or update of State, local, or Indian tribal mitigation plans which meet the planning criteria established by the Administrator, except that the amount from grants under this section that may be used under this subparagraph may not exceed \$50,000 for any mitigation plan of a State or \$25,000 for any mitigation plan of a local government or Indian tribe";

(vi) in subparagraph (I); as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, by striking "and" at the end; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(J) other mitigation activities not described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) or the regulations issued under subparagraph (I), that are described in the mitigation plan of a State, community, or Indian tribe; and

"(K) personnel costs for State staff that provide technical assistance to communities to identify eligible activities, to develop grant applications, and to implement grants awarded under this section, not to exceed \$50,000 per State in any Federal fiscal year, so long as the State applied for and was awarded at least \$1,000,000 in grants available under this section in the prior Federal fiscal year; the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2) shall not apply to the activity under this subparagraph."; and

(D) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (c);

(6) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following new subsection:

"(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator may provide grants for eligible mitigation activities as follows:

"(1) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to severe repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 100 percent of all eligible costs.

“(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 90 percent of all eligible costs.

“(3) OTHER MITIGATION ACTIVITIES.— In the case of all other mitigation activities, in an amount up to 75 percent of all eligible costs.”;

(7) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “certified under subsection (g)” and inserting “required under subsection (d)”;

(ii) by striking “3 times the amount” and inserting “the amount”;

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (e);

(8) in subsection (j)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994” and inserting “Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011”;

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (f); and

(9) by striking subsections (k) and (m) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(g) FAILURE TO MAKE GRANT AWARD WITHIN 5 YEARS.—For any application for a grant under this section for which the Administrator fails to make a grant award within 5 years of the date of application, the grant application shall be considered to be denied and any funding amounts allocated for such grant applications shall remain in the National Flood Mitigation Fund under section 1367 of this title and shall be made available for grants under this section.

“(h) LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FOR SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—The amount used pursuant to section 1310(a)(8) in any fiscal year may not exceed \$40,000,000 and shall remain available until expended.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) COMMUNITY.—The term ‘community’ means—

“(A) a political subdivision that—

“(i) has zoning and building code jurisdiction over a particular area having special flood hazards, and

“(ii) is participating in the national flood insurance program; or

“(B) a political subdivision of a State, or other authority, that is designated by political subdivisions, all of which meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), to administer grants for mitigation activities for such political subdivisions.

“(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term ‘repetitive loss structure’ has the meaning given such term in section 1370.

“(3) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term ‘severe repetitive loss structure’ means a structure that—

“(A) is covered under a contract for flood insurance made available under this title; and

“(B) has incurred flood-related damage—

“(i) for which 4 or more separate claims payments have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title, with the amount of each such claim exceeding \$15,000, and with the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeding \$60,000; or

“(ii) for which at least 2 separate claims payments have been made under such coverage, with the cumulative amount of such claims exceeding the value of the insured structure.”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF GRANTS PROGRAM FOR REPETITIVE INSURANCE CLAIMS PROPERTIES.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1323 (42 U.S.C. 4030).

(c) ELIMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR MITIGATION OF SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES.—Chapter III of the National

Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1361A (42 U.S.C. 4102a).

(d) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND.—Section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraphs (8) and (9).

(e) NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND.—Section 1367 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(1) in each fiscal year, from the National Flood Insurance Fund in amounts not exceeding \$90,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which—

“(A) not more than \$40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(1);

“(B) not more than \$40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(2); and

“(C) not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(3).”.

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “section 1366(i)” and inserting “section 1366(e)”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “sections 1366 and 1323” and inserting “section 1366”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) PROHIBITION ON OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, amounts made available pursuant to this section shall not be subject to offsetting collections through premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title.

“(e) CONTINUED AVAILABILITY AND REALLOCATION.—Any amounts made available pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) that are not used in any fiscal year shall continue to be available for the purposes specified in such subparagraph of subsection (b)(1) pursuant to which such amounts were made available, unless the Administrator determines that reallocation of such unused amounts to meet demonstrated need for other mitigation activities under section 1366 is in the best interest of the National Flood Insurance Fund.”.

(f) INCREASED COST OF COMPLIANCE COVERAGE.—Section 1304(b)(4) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

Page 32, line 6, before the period insert the following: “, and includes an adequate number of representatives from the States with coastline on the Gulf of Mexico and other States containing areas identified by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency as at high-risk for flooding or special flood hazard areas”.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Page 50, line 20, insert “TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS” after “NOTIFICATION”.

Page 51, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 16. NOTIFICATION AND APPEAL OF MAP CHANGES; NOTIFICATION TO COMMUNITIES OF ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOD ELEVATIONS.

Section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104) is amended by striking the section designation and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 1363. (a) In establishing projected flood elevations for land use purposes with respect to any community pursuant to section 1361, the Director shall first propose such determinations—

“(1) by providing the chief executive officer of each community affected by the proposed elevations, by certified mail, with a return receipt requested, notice of the elevations, including a copy of the maps for the elevations for such community and a statement explaining the process under this section to appeal for changes in such elevations;

“(2) by causing notice of such elevations to be published in the Federal Register, which notice shall include information sufficient to identify the elevation determinations and the communities affected, information explaining how to obtain copies of the elevations, and a statement explaining the process under this section to appeal for changes in the elevations;

“(3) by publishing in a prominent local newspaper the elevations, a description of the appeals process for flood determinations, and the mailing address and telephone number of a person the owner may contact for more information or to initiate an appeal; and

“(4) by providing written notification, by first class mail, to each owner of real property affected by the proposed elevations of—

“(A) the status of such property, both prior to and after the effective date of the proposed determination, with respect to flood zone and flood insurance requirements under this Act and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973;

“(B) the process under this section to appeal a flood elevation determination; and

“(C) the mailing address and phone number of a person the owner may contact for more information or to initiate an appeal.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

Page 56, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 20. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION WITH CERTAIN COMMUNITIES DURING MAP UPDATING PROCESS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) ENHANCED COMMUNICATION WITH CERTAIN COMMUNITIES DURING MAP UPDATING PROCESS.—In updating flood insurance maps under this section, the Administrator shall communicate with communities located in areas where flood insurance rate maps have not been updated in 20 years or more and the appropriate State emergency agencies to resolve outstanding issues, provide technical assistance, and disseminate all necessary information to reduce the prevalence of outdated maps in flood-prone areas.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

Page 57, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 21. INFORMATION REGARDING MULTIPLE PERILS CLAIMS.

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:

“(d) INFORMATION REGARDING MULTIPLE PERILS CLAIMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if an insured having flood insurance coverage

under a policy issued under the program under this title by the Administrator or a company, insurer, or entity offering flood insurance coverage under such program (in this subsection referred to as a "participating company") has wind or other homeowners coverage from any company, insurer, or other entity covering property covered by such flood insurance, in the case of damage to such property that may have been caused by flood or by wind, the Administrator and the participating company, upon the request of the insured, shall provide to the insured, within 30 days of such request—

"(A) a copy of the estimate of structure damage;

"(B) proofs of loss;

"(C) any expert or engineering reports or documents commissioned by or relied upon by the Administrator or participating company in determining whether the damage was caused by flood or any other peril; and

"(D) the Administrator's or the participating company's final determination on the claim.

"(2) **TIMING.**—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to a request described in such paragraph made by an insured after the Administrator or the participating company, or both, as applicable, have issued a final decision on the flood claim involved and resolution of all appeals with respect to such claim."

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Page 70, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 27. REPORT ON FLOOD-IN-PROGRESS DETERMINATION.

The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall review the processes and procedures for determining that a flood event has commenced or is in progress for purposes of flood insurance coverage made available under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and for providing public notification that such an event has commenced or is in progress. In such review, the Administrator shall take into consideration the effects and implications that weather conditions, such as rainfall, snowfall, projected snowmelt, existing water levels, and other conditions have on the determination that a flood event has commenced or is in progress. Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the results and conclusions of the review undertaken pursuant to this section and any actions undertaken or proposed actions to be taken to provide for a more precise and technical determination that a flooding event has commenced or is in progress.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. CANSECO

On page 70, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 27. STUDY ON REPAYING FLOOD INSURANCE DEBT.

Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth a plan for repaying within 10 years all amounts, including any amounts previously borrowed but not yet repaid, owed pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)).

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 28. AUTHORITY FOR THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of a State or local government, the Secretary of the Army may evaluate a levee system that was designed or constructed by the Secretary for the purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A levee system evaluation under subsection (a) shall—

(1) comply with applicable regulations related to areas protected by a levee system;

(2) be carried out in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, may establish; and

(3) be carried out only if the State or local government agrees to reimburse the Secretary for all cost associated with the performance of the activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 8, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 8 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 17, strike "section 1361A(b)" and insert "section 1366(j)".

Strike line 10 on page 47 and all that follows through page 48, line 15.

Strike line 16 on page 48 and all that follows through page 49, line 19 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) **MITIGATION ASSISTANCE GRANTS.**—Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: "Such financial assistance shall be made available—

"(1) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities;

"(2) to States and communities in the form of grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to severe repetitive loss structures; and

"(3) to property owners in the form of direct grants under this section for carrying out mitigation activities that reduce flood damage to individual structures for which 2 or more claim payments for losses have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title if the Administrator, after consultation with the State and community, determines that neither the State nor community in which such a structure is located has the capacity to manage such grants."

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "flood risk" and inserting "multi-hazard";

(B) by striking "provides protection against" and inserting "examines reduction of"; and

(C) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (b);

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking the paragraph designation and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(1) **REQUIREMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH APPROVED MITIGATION PLAN.**—Amounts provided under this section may be used only for mitigation activities that are consistent with mitigation plans that are approved by the

Administrator and identified under subparagraph (4).";

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(2) **REQUIREMENTS OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY, COST EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEREST OF NFIF.**—The Administrator may approve only mitigation activities that the Administrator determines are technically feasible and cost-effective and in the interest of, and represent savings to, the National Flood Insurance Fund. In making such determinations, the Administrator shall take into consideration recognized benefits that are difficult to quantify.

"(3) **PRIORITY FOR MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.**—In providing grants under this section for mitigation activities, the Administrator shall give priority for funding to activities that the Administrator determines will result in the greatest savings to the National Flood Insurance Fund, including activities for—

"(A) severe repetitive loss structures;

"(B) repetitive loss structures; and

"(C) other subsets of structures as the Administrator may establish.";

(i) by striking all of the matter that precedes subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(4) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—Eligible activities may include—";

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (H);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (E), (G), and (H);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) elevation, relocation, and floodproofing of utilities (including equipment that serve structures);";

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (E), as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following new subparagraph:

"(F) the development or update of State, local, or Indian tribal mitigation plans which meet the planning criteria established by the Administrator, except that the amount from grants under this section that may be used under this subparagraph may not exceed \$50,000 for any mitigation plan of a State or \$25,000 for any mitigation plan of a local government or Indian tribe";

(vi) in subparagraph (H); as so redesignated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, by striking "and" at the end; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(I) other mitigation activities not described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) or the regulations issued under subparagraph (H), that are described in the mitigation plan of a State, community, or Indian tribe; and

"(J) personnel costs for State staff that provide technical assistance to communities to identify eligible activities, to develop grant applications, and to implement grants awarded under this section, not to exceed \$50,000 per State in any Federal fiscal year, so long as the State applied for and was awarded at least \$1,000,000 in grants available under this section in the prior Federal fiscal year; the requirements of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2) shall not apply to the activity under this subparagraph.";

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) **ELIGIBILITY OF DEMOLITION AND REBUILDING OF PROPERTIES.**—The Administrator shall consider as an eligible activity the demolition and rebuilding of properties to at least base flood elevation or greater, if required by the Administrator or if required by any State regulation or local ordinance, and in accordance with criteria established by the Administrator."; and

(E) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (c);

(6) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator may provide grants for eligible mitigation activities as follows:

“(1) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to severe repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 100 percent of all eligible costs.

“(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—In the case of mitigation activities to repetitive loss structures, in an amount up to 90 percent of all eligible costs.

“(3) OTHER MITIGATION ACTIVITIES.— In the case of all other mitigation activities, in an amount up to 75 percent of all eligible costs.”;

(7) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “certified under subsection (g)” and inserting “required under subsection (d)”;

(ii) by striking “3 times the amount” and inserting “the amount”;

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (e);

(8) in subsection (j)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994” and inserting “Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011”;

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (f); and

(9) by striking subsections (k) and (m) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(g) FAILURE TO MAKE GRANT AWARD WITHIN 5 YEARS.—For any application for a grant under this section for which the Administrator fails to make a grant award within 5 years of the date of application, the grant application shall be considered to be denied and any funding amounts allocated for such grant applications shall remain in the National Flood Mitigation Fund under section 1367 of this title and shall be made available for grants under this section.

“(h) LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FOR SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURES.—The amount used pursuant to section 1310(a)(8) in any fiscal year may not exceed \$40,000,000 and shall remain available until expended.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) COMMUNITY.—The term ‘community’ means—

“(A) a political subdivision that—

“(i) has zoning and building code jurisdiction over a particular area having special flood hazards, and

“(ii) is participating in the national flood insurance program; or

“(B) a political subdivision of a State, or other authority, that is designated by political subdivisions, all of which meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), to administer grants for mitigation activities for such political subdivisions.

“(2) REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term ‘repetitive loss structure’ has the meaning given such term in section 1370.

“(3) SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRUCTURE.—The term ‘severe repetitive loss structure’ means a structure that—

“(A) is covered under a contract for flood insurance made available under this title; and

“(B) has incurred flood-related damage—

“(i) for which 4 or more separate claims payments have been made under flood insurance coverage under this title, with the amount of each such claim exceeding \$15,000, and with the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeding \$60,000; or

“(ii) for which at least 2 separate claims payments have been made under such cov-

erage, with the cumulative amount of such claims exceeding the value of the insured structure.”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF GRANTS PROGRAM FOR REPETITIVE INSURANCE CLAIMS PROPERTIES.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1323 (42 U.S.C. 4030).

(c) ELIMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR MITIGATION OF SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES.—Chapter III of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking section 1361A (42 U.S.C. 4102a).

(d) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND.—Section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraphs (8) and (9).

(e) NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND.—Section 1367 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(1) in each fiscal year, from the National Flood Insurance Fund in amounts not exceeding \$90,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which—

“(A) not more than \$40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(1);

“(B) not more than \$40,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(2); and

“(C) not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section only for assistance described in section 1366(a)(3).”.

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “section 1366(i)” and inserting “section 1366(e)”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “sections 1366 and 1323” and inserting “section 1366”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) PROHIBITION ON OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, amounts made available pursuant to this section shall not be subject to offsetting collections through premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title.

“(e) CONTINUED AVAILABILITY AND REALLOCATION.—Any amounts made available pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) that are not used in any fiscal year shall continue to be available for the purposes specified in such subparagraph of subsection (b)(1) pursuant to which such amounts were made available, unless the Administrator determines that reallocation of such unused amounts to meet demonstrated need for other mitigation activities under section 1366 is in the best interest of the National Flood Insurance Fund.”.

(f) INCREASED COST OF COMPLIANCE COVERAGE.—Section 1304(b)(4) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

Mrs. BIGGERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the modification.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan package of amendments that we are accepting. I urge my colleagues to support the amendments en bloc.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairwoman BIGGERT and Ranking Member WATERS for their leadership and their support for my amendment to phase in higher flood insurance rates when preferred risk policies are no longer available in a community.

I represent the city of Sacramento, which is home to both the American and Sacramento rivers. After New Orleans, we are the most at-risk river city in our Nation.

Since Hurricane Katrina, more than 25,000 homeowners in my district have been remapped, and for them flood insurance is now mandatory.

Their flood insurance costs increased from the PRP rate of \$350 to over \$1,350 overnight.

□ 1510

The sticker shock to a homeowner, whether it be a senior citizen on a fixed income or a family struggling to make ends meet, is unreasonable.

My amendment would simply raise the cost of flood insurance from remapped areas from the PRP rate to the full price rate over a period of 5 years. Specifically, my amendment would start the phase-in for homeowners at their current PRP rate. Each year after that, the price of flood insurance would rise by 20 percent until it reaches its full price in year 5.

My amendment will save the average policyholder in a remapped area about \$843 over 5 years while not impacting the solvency of the NFIP. I believe this to be a fair and equitable way forward, especially in these trying economic times.

Again, I thank Chairwoman BIGGERT and Ranking Member WATERS for their leadership. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, this en bloc amendment is perfectly fine with us, and I urge its adoption.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. I would like to thank Chairwoman BIGGERT for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act. As a representative of the Katrina-devastated Mississippi Gulf Coast, I understand both the importance of the National Flood Insurance Program but also the need for its reform.

I have introduced two amendments to the bill which will be a part of the en bloc amendment. The first calls for the newly created Technical Mapping Advisory Council to include members from coastal or other high-risk flood areas. This assures that the advisory council has members that are not just technical experts but have experienced firsthand the hardship and heartbreak catastrophic flooding and damage causes families and communities.

My other amendment allows any claimant to obtain from the administrator any engineering reports or other documents relied on in determining whether the damage was caused by flood or any other peril. When the FEMA administrator or participating company have the task of determining whether a home's damage was caused by wind or by water, the policyholder would now have the right to request those documents relied upon in making that determination.

It is my belief that transparency in government is important, especially for policyholders. For those who may have lost their property, they have the right to know the details in the determination of their claim.

I urge your support of both of my amendments as well as the full passage of H.R. 1309.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Representatives TERRY and BERG's amendment to H.R. 1309.

As you may know, the Missouri River Basin is in the midst of record flooding. In order to determine a trigger date for a flood-in-progress, FEMA's National Flood Insurance Program sent an examiner to Garrison Dam in North Dakota at the end of May on a fact-finding mission. After looking at the dam and both sides of the river, the adjuster determined a flood was in progress and declared June 1st as the trigger date for the entire Missouri River Basin.

The flooding along the Missouri River stretches more than one thousand miles and is affecting multiple states. Very few homes in South Dakota were underwater on June 1st, yet this trigger date is used to determine if flood insurance policies are valid, regardless of location and when flooding actually began.

Not all my constituents along the Missouri River have flood insurance. Some, however, had the foresight to purchase a policy prior to being underwater, and, more importantly, prior to FEMA's declaration that June 1st was the universal flood-in-progress date. Flood insurance requires a 30-day wait period before the policy becomes effective. Individuals who purchased flood insurance on May 1st will be covered for their losses in this flood, but those who waited until May 2nd are out of luck. This amendment rectifies this problem. It would

allow for reasonable flexibility for policy holders when a universal trigger date is used for such a vast multi-state event.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I urge support for the amendments en bloc.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

The amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, as the designee for Mr. BACHUS, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, strike the dash in line 3 and all that follows through line 10 and insert "designation of the area as having special flood hazards in a timely manner under section 1363."

Page 7, after line 21 insert the following:

"(5) ADDITIONAL EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITIES MAKING MORE THAN ADEQUATE PROGRESS ON FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEM.—

"(A) EXTENSION.—

"(i) AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in the case of an eligible area for which the Administrator has, pursuant to paragraph (4), extended the period of effectiveness of the finding under paragraph (1) for the area, upon a request submitted by a local government authority having jurisdiction over any portion of the eligible area, if the Administrator finds that more than adequate progress has been made on the construction of a flood protection system for such area, as determined in accordance with the last sentence of section 1307(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(e)), the Administrator may, in the discretion of the Administrator, further extend the period during which the finding under paragraph (1) shall be effective for such area for an additional 12 months.

"(ii) LIMIT.—For any eligible area, the cumulative number of extensions under this subparagraph may not exceed 2.

"(B) EXCLUSION FOR NEW MORTGAGES.—

"(i) EXCLUSION.—Any extension under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph of a finding under paragraph (1) shall not be effective with respect to any excluded property after the origination, increase, extension, or renewal of the loan referred to in clause (ii)(II) for the property.

"(ii) EXCLUDED PROPERTIES.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'excluded property' means any improved real estate or mobile home—

"(I) that is located in an eligible area; and

"(II) for which, during the period that any extension under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph of a finding under paragraph (1) is otherwise in effect for the eligible area in which such property is located—

"(aa) a loan that is secured by the property is originated; or

"(bb) any existing loan that is secured by the property is increased, extended, or renewed."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of amendment No. 2, drafted by the chairman and my friend, Mr. BACHUS, to help solve a problem that is prevalent in my district as well as many rural districts across the heartland.

As you know, this flood insurance issue affects every town, but especially those along the riverbanks. And FEMA's new requirements that require many of these small towns to make necessary improvements in their upgrades of their levees and dams require significant investment, investment that America's small businesses, family farms, and private properties will have to come up with the revenue to pay for.

This amendment in no way seeks to get anyone off the hook but, rather, to give them the necessary time given the large investments that many of these small towns will have to make, given the economic times that we are in right now, and recognizing that many of these small towns will require more than the 3 years as is allowed in the underlying bill to make the necessary improvements.

It does require, however, in years 4 and 5, which this amendment allows for an extension of the years 4 and 5, to allow to make the improvements. But those communities have to show stated improvement or at least progress toward the final necessary improvements in years 4 and 5 in order for them to get the necessary extension.

So I think it makes sense. It's a pretty commonsense amendment.

And I just want to say thank you personally to Chairman BACHUS for his work with other members of my delegation in Illinois and, I know, those along the Mississippi and other waterways whose towns are feeling the pain of many of these new unfunded mandates put forward by FEMA.

With that, I would urge passage of amendment No. 2.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COSTELLO. Let me thank my friend Mr. CAPUANO for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to first thank the chair of the subcommittee, the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and also the ranking member, MAXINE WATERS, as well as Chairman BACHUS and Ranking Member FRANK of the full committee, and also my friend Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. SHIMKUS from Illinois. We all worked on this amendment together. It's a good amendment.

As I think Mr. SCHOCK just explained, the Bachus amendment gives the administrator the authority to allow for a possible fourth and fifth suspension of the mandatory purchase for certain communities that are making adequate progress in construction of the flood protection system.

It's a commonsense amendment. It's a bipartisan agreement. I urge its adoption, and I not only support the amendment but the underlying bill as well.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the author of the amendment, the chairman of the committee, SPENCER BACHUS.

Mr. BACHUS. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

I believe this is a noncontroversial amendment. It will encourage local governments to undertake repairs and remedial efforts. And I believe it is a fair, equitable change in the bill to reward local and State governments for their efforts.

With that, I would recommend passage of the amendment.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-138.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, after line 22, insert the following new subsection:

(d) PENALTIES FOR REQUIRING PURCHASE OF COVERAGE EXCEEDING MINIMUM MANDATORY PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 102(f) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) in connection with the making, increasing, extending, servicing, or renewing of any loan, requiring the purchase of flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, or purchasing such coverage pursuant to subsection (e)(2), in an amount in excess of the minimum amount required under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1520

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present this amendment. This actually was adopted by a voice vote in the Financial Services Com-

mittee in 2010; and my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman BIGGERT, may recall it. It was something that came up in my district where an elderly woman, living on Social Security, had a mortgage balance on her home of \$13,000; but because she was being included in a newly mapped flood zone, her bank required her to purchase the full \$250,000 in flood insurance at a cost of more than \$2,400 per year.

I would venture to say that we don't see ourselves as being in the insurance business by choice. We are in the flood insurance business out of necessity, and it would seem to me that it doesn't make a lot of sense to impose an obligation on homeowners to purchase insurance that exceeds the actual cost of their mortgage, especially when we note that the average flood damage claims are anywhere from \$25,000 to \$35,000. So to require someone who has a \$13,000 loan balance to purchase flood insurance for \$250,000 and pay a fee, a yearly premium of \$2,400, is just, I think, unacceptable; and I would think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would like to do something for those people who have been responsible, pay down their mortgages, and have small balances.

This particular amendment makes it a violation for a lender, whose only interest in the property is the amount of the outstanding mortgage indebtedness, to use the National Flood Insurance Program to require a homeowner to purchase more than the legally required amount of flood insurance, an amount equal to the outstanding principal balance. Nothing, however, would prohibit a homeowner who wished to purchase more coverage from doing so, and nothing would preclude a mortgage lender from including such a requirement in the mortgage contract up front, as long as it was fully disclosed. In both cases, the homeowner would be able to make a choice, and this would be full disclosure as well.

In California, where we have mandatory auto insurance, once a car owner has discharged their debt on the car, they are no longer obligated to carry coverage for the damage to their own car, only the liability insurance if they crash into someone else's car. This amendment is very consistent with giving people a choice as well. Again, I offer this amendment and ask for its support.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment would impose penalties against lenders who require borrowers to maintain flood insurance in an amount greater than the outstanding principal balance of the loan.

Limiting the amount of coverage to the unpaid principal balance leaves

consumers at risk of having to incur the costs of repair on their own and, additionally, is not reflective of the current state of industry practices. In fact, with the exception of VA loans, limiting insurance to the unpaid principal balance is not recommended under existing law.

Consumers, not lenders, will bear the financial brunt of a disaster. Limiting flood insurance to the unpaid principal balance may protect the lender's financial interest in the property; however, it doesn't protect the consumer's equity and investment in the property.

NFIP establishes the minimum amount of coverage required at the lesser of the outstanding balance of the loan or the maximum available NFIP coverage, which today is \$250,000 for residential and \$500,000 for commercial properties.

The standard NFIP dwelling flood policy requires that one to two family owner-occupied dwellings be insured for the replacement value in order for losses to be paid for the cost to repair or replace the property. If these properties are not insured for at least 80 percent of the replacement value at the time of loss, the policyholder cannot obtain the full benefits of the policy and may not receive sufficient funds to repair or replace the property damaged by flood.

Guidelines issued by Federal regulators encourage and authorize lenders to require flood insurance at replacement cost, not to exceed NFIP maximum available coverage. The guidelines also urge lenders to follow the same rules in calculating flood coverage as they do in calculating hazard coverage, where standard industry practice is to require coverage at replacement cost.

In the case of condominiums, the guidelines issued by Federal regulators require lenders to ensure that flood protection has been obtained for the replacement value of the property improvements, not to exceed the NFIP maximum limits.

I would request a “no” vote on the Speier amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 24, strike the second semicolon and insert “; and”.

Strike paragraph (3) of section 4(c) (page 15, lines 1 and 2).

Page 15, line 5, strike “(8)” and insert “(6)”.

Page 15, line 6, strike “(2), (3), (4), (5), and (6)” and insert “(2), (3), and (4)”.

Strike subsection (d) of section 4 (page 16, line 1 and all that follows through page 18, line 10).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

This amendment would strike additional flood-related coverage provided in the underlying bill for business interruption and cost-of-living expenses. Specifically, this amendment would prohibit FEMA from offering individuals up to \$5,000 for living expenses and up to \$20,000 for interruption of business expenses.

I understand that the committee worked to ensure that the inclusion of this additional coverage would be provided at fully actuarial rates, but let me remind this body that Congress does not have a great track record when it comes to pricing risks. One has to look no further than Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to see an example of that, or just look at this program, itself.

The National Flood Insurance Program is about \$18 billion in the red. Let me say that again. We have a Federal flood insurance program that currently owes the Treasury Department nearly \$18 billion, so we shouldn't take at face value the notion that any new coverage that's offered is priced at fully actuarial rates.

This expansion of coverage will only increase taxpayer liability, which is the last thing that this Congress ought to do with a program so severely in debt and with a country so severely in debt. Instead, we should be passing legislation to narrow the scope of the NFIP, not to expand it.

Simply put, any reform to the NFIP should be moving toward privatization, and I am sure this belief is shared by a number of my colleagues. Voting against this amendment is a vote to expand the current National Flood Insurance Program. Again, a vote against this amendment is a vote to expand the current flood insurance program, a program that is currently \$18 billion in debt to the U.S. Treasury.

My understanding is that private market participants are hesitant to offer this type of coverage because it is not profitable for them to do so. I'm not sure I've ever seen an instance where government involvement in the market incentivized the private sector to compete. In fact, according to testimony from Taxpayers for Common Sense:

“We have learned from Federal flood insurance itself that the best way to

stifle a private market is to have the Federal Government provide the same product.” That simply makes sense.

When you have a Federal Government borrowing 41 cents on the dollar, the last thing we need to do is expand an insurance program that is already \$18 billion in the red. Again, voting for this amendment isn't to cut this program—I wish it were—but it is simply to not allow the program to expand further.

□ 1530

FEMA estimated that had this same policy been enacted in 2005 before Katrina and Rita hit, combined losses from additional expenses and business interruption would have been about \$600 million in net losses. If you consider the increase in policies since 2005, they estimated if we had another 2005-like year, this additional coverage would result in \$850 million in net losses just for 2011. We can't afford to do that, Mr. Chairman.

If there is no private market for this type of coverage, we ought to understand why there is no private market, and having government enter the marketplace will only ensure there is no private market for it. We shouldn't be comforted by the notion that we will hear, I am sure, that the premiums will be priced at fully actuarial rates. That's saying that there's no private market out there, government has to be involved, but we have priced it as if the private sector were involved. Anybody who believes that, I have a bridge somewhere to sell you. Government entrance into this type of marketplace is simply not right. We shouldn't be doing it. And to my colleagues who think that we have a debt problem today, think what problem we will have if we have another year like 2005.

According to FEMA's only projections, it could result in \$850 million in net losses. So I would urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I don't think anyone in this Congress is more sincere on cutting government spending than Mr. FLAKE. I believe he comes here with pure motivation. I would simply say this to him and my colleagues: this is an issue that we carefully considered. It was first proposed as a result of Katrina and the losses there. As he said correctly, this program is \$16 billion in the red. After Katrina, the Federal Government through FEMA, SBA and others, paid out several billion dollars not on the flood insurance program but paid out an estimated \$6 billion or \$7 billion to

businesses because of their losses from business interruption and temporary shelter and living expenses.

In 2006, really as a result of that, the subcommittee chairman, Richard Baker, held hearings and determined that business interruption and cost-of-living coverage should be included. It has passed the House, but we have actually since then never passed a flood insurance reform bill.

As all of us know, and I think all of us agree, the legislation before us today has already been scored as a \$4.2 billion savings. The reason that it saves money, the reason that it takes a program that is costing taxpayers money every day is because it requires a risk-based premium. Now, beyond that, it also requires reinsurance if the risk-based premium proves insufficient. So it has a cushion.

It also says that if private insurers will offer this plan, then the government will not. It makes a finding that a competitive private market for such coverage does not exist. That was actually based on 2006 and again last year. It certifies that the National Flood Insurance Program will offer such coverage with the prohibition that it is supplemented by taxpayer money from the Treasury. This was a concern that many of us, including Mr. FLAKE, you know, had, that the taxpayer would end up subsidizing this.

This legislation with this provision actually scores as a \$4.2 billion savings over the next 10 years. Actually, I think it could be greater than that because, as Mr. FLAKE said, we don't know what is going to happen next year or the year after that. We do know this: we know when we have one of these, and in fact this year is a great example, when we have four \$1 billion disasters, what did this Congress do? It appropriated disaster assistance. And that included reimbursement for living expenses and business interruption. Not only that, but the SBA, the Agricultural Department and I can't imagine how many others that we don't know about, FEMA, as a realistic matter, they are handing out checks every day when we have these disasters. Local and State governments are doing the same.

Why not, instead of this being handed out, why not have the people who own the businesses, who are living there, why not offer them coverage and let them pay the premium and let them share the loss? There are many places in the West where a flood, it would be almost impossible. There are many places in this country where a flood is simply not a problem. Why should those people be required to pay taxpayer money for what has become basically the Federal Government coming in and reimbursing everyone that doesn't have insurance? That is a question that we have asked.

We have just had the largest outbreak of tornadoes and death in the United States in Alabama. I have heard people say we have a situation where

there is no insurance and the Federal Government comes in and says, if you have insurance, you have got it covered; and if you don't, we'll make it up. I don't like that idea. I think it encourages people not to have coverage.

This offers them coverage. The next step is telling them no to these others program; you should have had insurance.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-138.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, strike lines 10 to 13.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman.

My amendment is quite simple. It removes the 100 percent increase and possible flood insurance rate increases from the underlying bill. Currently, rate increases are capped at 10 percent a year; yet this bill would double that to 20 percent per year.

Homeowners in this down-turned economy can little afford to have this looming possibility. One in four Floridians is covered under the National Flood Insurance Program, and they collectively pay nearly \$900 million in premiums per year. Since 1978, Florida policyholders have paid \$14.1 billion in premiums and have received only \$3.6 billion in payments. That is 3.9 times more in premiums than they received in claims.

Our residents, usually in high-risk flood areas, pay disproportionately more in premiums than they will likely ever see in payments on claims. Despite this fact, Floridians were near the cap of a 10 percent increase in the premium rates from the years 2009 and 2010, while the average national increase during the same time was 8 percent.

□ 1540

Despite these problems, the residents in my area say they need this program,

but they need this cap where it is. People outside of at-risk areas file over 20 percent of NFIP claims and receive one-third of disaster assistance for flooding. Floridians, my constituents, know that the doubling of the amount that FEMA can charge for their flood insurance is aimed at them.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which is one that will prevent unnecessary and unprecedented rate hikes for hardworking Americans on their flood insurance bills.

I yield the balance of my time to my good friend from Florida (Ms. WILSON). (Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I rise today in support of this bipartisan amendment that strikes a blow for fairness for those consumers who need flood insurance. I rise along with my colleagues from Florida: Representative LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, DAVID RIVERA, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, and RUSH HOLT.

I am a proud Floridian by birth. I make Florida my home. Most of my family and friends live in the great State of Florida. On top of our sunshine, Florida has a regular hurricane season and torrential rainfalls. The majority of the people who live in Florida live in this reality for the majority of their lives. However, flooding does not only affect the State of Florida, so I want to ensure that taxpayers who live in flood zones do not pay too much for their vitally needed flood insurance. This amendment is very simple:

It prevents flood insurance rates from potentially going up 100 percent. The current cap on flood insurance rate increases in a given year is 10 percent. My amendment would keep it that way. This commonsense, bipartisan amendment is fiscally responsible. It protects consumers, and it ensures that the National Flood Insurance Program will remain sound.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment that strikes a blow for fairness for those consumers who need flood insurance. Along with my colleagues Reps. LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, DAVID RIVERA, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, and RUSH HOLT, I want to ensure that taxpayers who live in flood zones do not pay too much for their vitally needed flood insurance. My amendment is very simple. It prevents flood insurance rates from going up 100%. The current cap on flood insurance rates is ten percent. My amendment would keep it that way.

I am a proud Floridian by birth. I make Florida my home. Most of my family and friends live in the great State of Florida. On top of our sunshine, Florida has a regular hurricane season and torrential rainfalls. The majority of the people who live in Florida live with this reality for the majority of their lives. However, flooding does not only affect the State of Florida. Flooding is our Nation's most common disaster. While flooding affects every State, most private insurance companies do not offer their own flood insurance. Plus, standard homeowner insurance policies do not cover flooding.

In 1968, Congress started the National Flood Insurance Program, or the NFIP. This

allows homebuyers to purchase flood insurance for their homes. In Florida, you cannot get a mortgage on your property if you do not have a flood insurance policy on your home. Ninety percent of all flood insurance is done through the NFIP. There are more than 20,000 NFIP communities throughout our nation and all of them are not in Florida.

Since 1978, Florida policyholders have paid 14.1 billion dollars in premiums and have had 231,595 individual losses and received ONLY \$3.6 billion in payments—3.9 times more in premiums than they receive in claims. Yet Floridians had a 9.6% increase in premium rates from 2009 to 2010. Nationally, from 2009 to 2010, premiums increased an average of 8%.

The NFIP today covers approximately 5.6 billion households and businesses across the country for a total of \$1.25 trillion in exposure. Forty percent of those policies are held in Florida, and one in four Floridians is covered under NFIP. Floridians collectively pay nearly \$900 million in premiums per year.

The near \$19 billion in debts held by the NFIP are mostly as a result of the 2005 hurricane season (Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma) and the 2008 Midwest floods. While the average flood insurance policy is about \$600 per year, residents of high-risk flood areas pay disproportionately more in premiums. However, these residents do not take near the same proportion in payments on claims. Furthermore, individuals outside of high-risk areas file over 20% of NFIP claims and receive one-third of disaster assistance for flooding.

The NFIP paid \$709 million in flood insurance claims to homeowners, business owners, and renters in 2010. In fact, in 2010, New Jersey had the highest number of claims, and Tennessee had the highest payments on claims—not Florida. As a matter of fact, Florida was not in the top 10 in either category of claims or payments.

I thank the Chair for the time. My commonsense amendment is fiscally responsible, protects consumers, and ensures that the NFIP will remain sound.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN's amendment, while well intentioned, would prevent the National Flood Insurance Program from moving toward a more actuarially sound basis for calculating premiums in as quick a manner as possible.

The underlying bill provides that FEMA, at the discretion of the administrator, can increase the chargeable premiums for flood policyholders by up to 20 percent once every 12 months until the premium being paid properly reflects the risk associated with the property.

The amendment is intended to save policyholders from the "sticker shock" premium increases potentially pose, but the underlying bill addresses this concern by allowing for a gradual phase-in of the actuarial rates instead of an abrupt adjustment.

One of the core goals of this bill is to move the NFIP towards a more actuarially sound, properly functioning

program, and any amendment to slow down that effort must be opposed.

The amendment would strike part of section 5 that would increase annual limits on premium rates. It increases from 10 to 20 percent. The sponsors of the amendment have stated that their objective is to prevent a 100 percent increase in possible premium hikes, but what it's doing is really going to delay our being able to have a more actuarially sound basis for calculating the premiums in as quick a manner as possible.

Section 5 really addresses this concern by phasing in all of the non-FIRM properties to full actuarial rates over time to eliminate the subsidy and to allow the premiums paid for policies to reflect the risk covered by those policies. So I would oppose this amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment to maintain the 10 percent statutory NFIP premium increases.

While it is important to keep NFIP authorized and to begin solving its funding problems, we must make sure we are improving participation in the program and keeping premiums affordable. Low participation in NFIP in high-risk areas has been one of the program's most persistent challenges.

That is why I joined my colleagues in sponsoring this amendment. Doubling the maximum premium rate increase from 10 to 20 percent would hurt existing policyholders nationwide and in my Central New Jersey district.

If homeowners get hit with annual premium increases in excess of 10 percent, I am concerned that that they will decide flood insurance is something they can do without. And when a catastrophic event occurs, taxpayers will pick up the tab with disaster aid.

I have heard from homeowners, flood plain managers, insurers, and realtors in my congressional district about the importance of passing an extension of NFIP. Although I am pleased that we are considering the underlying bill, we should be encouraging more homeowners to obtain flood insurance, not placing an extra burden on policyholders who are doing the right thing protecting their homes from flood.

I ask my colleagues to join me supporting this amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. WALBERG. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(1) MORATORIUM ON FLOOD MAP CHANGES.—
(1) MORATORIUM.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other

provision of this Act, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, or the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, during the period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act and ending upon the submission by the Council to the Administrator and the Congress of the proposed new mapping standards required under subsection (c)(1), the Administrator may not make effective any new or updated rate maps for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program that were not in effect for such program as of such date of enactment, or otherwise revise, update, or change the flood insurance rate maps in effect for such program as of such date.

(2) LETTERS OF MAP CHANGE.—During the period described in paragraph (1), the Administrator may revise, update, and change the flood insurance rate maps in effect for the national flood insurance program only pursuant to a letter of map change (including a letter of map amendment, letter of map revision, and letter of map revision based on fill).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today addresses the most pressing concern my constituents have with the National Flood Insurance Program, and that problem is inaccurate flood maps.

I certainly understand that the NFIP is on shaky financial ground, and I commend Chairman BACHUS and Congresswoman BIGGERT and the Financial Services Committee for their work in crafting this bill; but as we vote today to put the NFIP on a path to solvency, we must not let this opportunity to strengthen the program pass us by.

Since I returned to Congress in January, my office has been barraged with letters and phone calls expressing concerns about the new and revised flood insurance rate maps that FEMA is rolling out in my district. These maps determine whether property owners will be required to purchase flood insurance, and evidence shows that the current mapping methods are oftentimes inaccurate, onerous or punitive; and while this insurance represents an essential lifeline to some property owners who face a real risk of flood damage, it is a costly, unnecessary mandate on those who face no actual threat of being flooded.

I am encouraged that the underlying bill, H.R. 1309, establishes a Technical Mapping Advisory Council to review the current mapping standards and that it proposes revised standards to be implemented by the FEMA administrator. Within 12 months of organization, the TMAC is required to report to Congress and the administrator on how to improve mapping methodology. H.R. 1309 clearly instructs the TMAC on their task, and that is to ensure that the flood insurance rate maps reflect true risk and that the most current and accurate data is used.

I look forward to receiving this report from TMAC and to the adminis-

trator's implementation of the new mapping standards; but in my view, this review is a tacit admission that the current practices are not working and that they represent a poorly implemented government mandate that cannot continue. The maps FEMA has been rolling out across the country are not based on the best information available, and this needs to stop.

My amendment improves on the work of the TMAC, simply requiring that, while the TMAC studies the best possible mapping methods, none of our constituents will be at risk of inclusion in a new map that uses the faulty, questionable methods currently in place. Simply put, this amendment would implement a moratorium on the issuance of new flood maps until the TMAC has done its due diligence and has issued its report on new mapping standards.

I am glad to have the support of Chairman BACHUS, and I ask that you support me in voting for this common-sense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPUANO. While I understand the gentleman's concern about the accuracy of the FEMA maps, this bill does contain a 3-year delay of mandatory purchase and a 5-year phase-in thereafter. That's 8 years. We already have mechanisms in this bill that would insulate homeowners from the sticker shock of mandatory purchase while still alerting them to the fact that they actually live in a flood zone.

I am very concerned that, in the absence of any maps, we place our homeowners and communities in the dark about the risks they may be facing. This is why the bill does not delay the maps, themselves, but only the mandatory purchase requirement. So, while I understand the gentleman's concerns, I must oppose his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1550

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CARDOZA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 23, after the semicolon insert "and".

Page 37, strike lines 1 through 3.

Page 37, line 4, strike "(C)" and insert "(B)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman

from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would remove onerous requirements on properties that already have existing flood protection and would prevent unnecessary economic harm to communities already struggling to recover.

My amendment strikes the language in the legislation requiring FEMA to include on its flood maps areas of residual risk. I'm offering this amendment because large areas across the country, such as large parts of the Central Valley and Los Angeles and Orange Counties, are already protected by existing levees and have no history of flooding, but would find themselves in newly designated "residual risk" floodplains under H.R. 1309. Such a policy would essentially map the entire area in the new residual risk flood zone as though the levee that had been protecting the community for years had never existed. This would have a significant economic impact, and in many cases more than double the insurance premiums of those regions throughout the country.

In the area I represent of Stockton, California, and other affected areas of the San Joaquin Valley, this bill would place in the floodplain an additional 280,000 people who currently have flood protection provided by significant levees.

In 1995, annual premium payments were estimated at \$30 million. The CBO estimates that rates will more than double under this bill, totaling an estimated \$68 million in annual premiums from the greater Stockton area alone. Floodplain building restrictions for these protected areas would have an even greater impact on the cost of construction. These building restrictions would substantially increase the cost of home construction and severely impact housing affordability at a time when the housing market is already on life support in my area.

For my district and many other districts across the country, entire communities would be mapped into the floodplain. Mapping areas that have existing flood protection for residual risk effectively amounts to double taxation of these regions, where citizens are paying taxes to the local flood control agencies and then having to pay additional flood insurance as well as a result of being mapped into these areas.

This mapping requirement would also remove an important incentive for State and local governments to invest in flood control projects. If communities will still have to buy flood insurance after they improve and protect their communities, then why would they devote precious resources to these expensive projects? The cost benefits just simply wouldn't exist.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would like to yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. CARDOZA.

He and I are fortunate to represent San Joaquin County in California, which is home to many, many miles of levees and waterways. His amendment is especially important to our constituents.

While the "residual risk" section of H.R. 1309 may be well intended, I believe it should be removed. We all believe that homeowners living in high-risk areas for flooding should have an insurance policy, but this language is overly broad and will hurt my constituents.

I've consulted closely with flood control officials from my district who share this concern and have expressed strong support for this amendment.

Our country is experiencing tough economic times, and we should take great care to protect homeowners from unnecessary burdens. Our homeowners are losing their homes; let's not give them an extra burden that will send many of them into the street.

I am proud to rise in support of this amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. CARDOZA, which will significantly improve the bill we are considering today.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment and prevent undue economic harm to our communities.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Under H.R. 1309, FEMA is required to update its flood maps according to the Technical Mapping Advisory Council's recommendations within 6 months or report to Congress why it has rejected them. As part of the new standard for the flood insurance rate maps, FEMA must include in any rate map areas of residual risk, including areas behind levees, dams and other manmade structures. I'm afraid that the Cardoza amendment would fail to provide homeowners with a real assessment of their risks, thereby impairing their ability to prepare for such natural disasters.

And to address concerns about the mapping process, H.R. 1309 reinstates the Technical Mapping Advisory Council to bring in the expertise and perspectives of other stakeholders in FEMA's process for setting new mapping standards. The amendment I think would weaken these new mapping standards that are designed to give homeowners and the NFIP an accurate portrait of flood risk, and I would oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 55, line 4, before "OBTAINING" insert "AND COMMUNITIES".

Page 55, line 5, before the period insert "OR REVISION".

Page 55, line 14, after "1973" insert ", or a community in which such a property is located."

Page 55, line 15, before "due" insert ", or a letter of map revision."

Page 55, line 19, after "behalf," insert "or such community, as applicable."

Page 56, line 2, after "owner" insert "or community, as applicable."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief.

My amendment is simple. If FEMA makes a mistake in designing a flood map, communities can be reimbursed for the cost of mounting a successful challenge. If FEMA makes a mistake in mapping a flood area, then they should pay for it. Doing so will result in significant savings for cities and towns and homeowners. And to me, this is something that should be non-controversial and hopefully wins bipartisan support.

Mr. Chair, I was pleased that the Rules Committee made in order my amendment to H.R. 1309.

My amendment is simple: if FEMA makes a mistake in designing a flood map, communities can be reimbursed the costs of mounting a successful challenge.

Currently, communities that dispute FEMA's flood elevations can hire a private engineering firm to get a "second opinion" flood map.

While this may sound like an attractive option, it puts small communities in a very difficult financial position. Hiring a private engineering firm is expensive and cost-prohibitive for many small communities.

On the one hand, if the community decides that it's too expensive to get a second opinion, homeowners are forced to pay higher, or in some cases, needless flood insurance premiums.

On the other hand, if the community does mount a successful challenge to the original FEMA map, homeowners are spared from having to pay the higher flood insurance premiums. But, the town must still pay the costs associated with obtaining that second map.

I've heard of many small communities that are forced into this tough situation, including the Town of Holliston in my district. There is substantial evidence to support the case that the FEMA flood map is inaccurate, but town officials are struggling to find a way to pay the estimated \$30,000 it would cost to conduct a second engineering study.

I feel for these town officials. They want to do the right thing and help their residents, but these small towns are already cash-strapped and cutting funding left and right for essential services like teachers, cops and firefighters. There simply is no money for a legitimate but expensive second opinion map.

If FEMA makes a mistake in mapping a flood area, they should pay for it. Doing so would relieve towns like Holliston from the enormous burden of fixing a mistake they did not make and saving residents hundreds of dollars in unnecessary flood insurance premiums.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 56, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 20. NOTIFICATION TO RESIDENTS NEWLY INCLUDED IN FLOOD HAZARD AREAS.

Section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) NOTIFICATION TO RESIDENTS NEWLY INCLUDED IN FLOOD HAZARD AREA.—In revising or updating any areas having special flood hazards, the Administrator shall provide to each owner of a property to be newly included in such a special flood hazard area, at the time of issuance of such proposed revised or updated flood insurance maps, a copy of the proposed revised or updated flood insurance maps together with information regarding the appeals process under section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment might well be described as the “Homeowner’s Right to Know.”

The original bill, H.R. 1309, contains several very positive notification requirements to help ensure that our constituents are more aware of the Na-

tional Flood Insurance Program, the flood mapping process, and how they can protect their property from the risk of flood. However, one critical area in which the underlying bill needs to require adequate notification is when a homeowner is being newly added into a revised or updated flood map.

□ 1600

My amendment would require the FEMA Administrator to provide a copy of a flood insurance risk map to property owners who are newly added to such a map along with information regarding the appeals process at the time the map is issued. The purpose is simple: One, bring more transparency to the flood mapping process; and, two, protect homeowners’ rights by ensuring they have adequate notice their property is being added to the floodplain while ensuring that they have the information about the appeals process.

Too often, homeowners aren’t even aware that FEMA is making changes to the flood maps in their communities until after a map is finalized and they receive a notice from their mortgage lender that they are now required to purchase flood insurance. Perhaps just as often, properties are not only unknowingly added to the floodplain, but they are added based on inconsistent or inaccurate data used by FEMA to create the maps. As a result, many homeowners are forced into buying flood insurance for the first time and mandated to do so when, in fact, their flood risk hasn’t changed.

Constituents in my own district have experienced these issues firsthand. One county in my district has been going through the remapping process for the past couple of years. Last year, FEMA introduced a draft map that would have added literally thousands of homes into the floodplain. In one portion of the county, I would estimate that nearly 10 percent of the total number of homes would be added by FEMA’s draft map, yet few people were even aware. I know they weren’t aware because I had conversations with insurance agents who write flood policies in the community, and they weren’t aware. I have had major developers who are building in that area talk to me about other related issues but didn’t know about the new draft map. To make matters worse, we believe the map was technically inaccurate. FEMA was using incongruent data. As a result, new floodplains were proposed when, in fact, flood risk could not increase.

In a second community, the outcry was so great that FEMA had to come back for a public town hall meeting to discuss the mapping process after the map went into effect. Local residents started getting notifications from their lenders that they needed to purchase flood insurance, and they simply didn’t know why. My office received calls from residents in one portion of that community where the homes have been

confirmed as nearly 8 feet above the highest recorded level of flooding in that area ever, but they were now in the floodplain. No one had bothered to tell them.

My amendment would ensure that in all these scenarios the homeowner would simply be notified that their home was potentially being added to a floodplain and tell them about their right to appeal. Homeowners deserve to be informed when the government is making decisions that impact their property. This simple amendment will ensure that they do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the amendment is perfectly fine, and we hope that it will be adopted.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 57, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 21. FEMA AUTHORITY TO REJECT TRANSFER OF POLICIES.

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:

“(d) FEMA AUTHORITY TO REJECT TRANSFER OF POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator may, at the discretion of the Administrator, refuse to accept the transfer of the administration of policies for coverage under the flood insurance program under this title that are written and administered by any insurance company or other insurer, or any insurance agent or broker.”

Strike line 23 on page 64 and all that follows through page 65, line 5, and insert the following new section:

SEC. 24. REQUIRING COMPETITION FOR NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM POLICIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, in consultation with insurance companies, insurance agents and other organizations with which the Administrator has contracted, shall submit to the Congress a report describing procedures and policies that the Administrator shall implement to limit the percentage of policies for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program that are directly managed by the Agency to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate number of flood insurance policies in force under such program.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Upon submission of the report under subsection (a) to the Congress, the Administrator shall implement the policies and procedures described in the report. The Administrator shall, not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon submission of such report, reduce the number of policies for flood insurance coverage that are directly managed by

the Agency, or by the Agency's direct servicing contractor that is not an insurer, to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate number of flood insurance policies in force as of the expiration of such 12-month period.

(C) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT AGENT RELATIONSHIPS.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Administrator shall ensure that—

(1) agents selling or servicing policies described in such subsection are not prevented from continuing to sell or service such policies; and

(2) insurance companies are not prevented from waiving any limitation such companies could otherwise enforce to limit any such activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise to offer an amendment that is coauthored by Chairman BACHUS and by my friend GREGORY MEEKS from New York. It is a bipartisan and, I hope, noncontroversial amendment.

This flood insurance program is usually a partnership between private companies and the Federal Government. The Write Your Own Program involves the companies servicing the policies. And one major company that used to write policies in this area decided to pull out of the program and turned over 800,000 policies to the Federal Government. The whole idea behind the program is that the Federal Government will administer as few of these insurance policies as possible.

The purpose of this amendment is to require that the vast majority of these policies be made available to be handled by private insurance companies. It is simply a privatization amendment. This includes language in the amendment designed to protect the agents of State Farm, which is the company that is no longer in this business, ensuring that they will be able to continue servicing the policies that shift from the Federal Government to private insurance companies. This is an effort to ensure that these policies are taken off the taxpayers' books without interfering in the relationship between consumers and their insurance agents.

I would hope that this would be a noncontroversial amendment. As I said, it is supported by the chairman of the committee and is offered on his behalf as well as the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment. As many of us on the Financial Services Committee know, the flood insurance program is a public-private partnership where private insurance companies

write the coverage and service the policies, with the government setting the coverage and the requirements.

Recently, State Farm Insurance decided that they no longer wanted to participate in the program, and they transferred—I guess that's a nice word. An unflattering term which is more accurate would be they dumped 800,000 policies back on the Federal Government. This was after they collected premiums and their agents sold the coverage.

This amendment would make changes to that, where if an insurance company wants to participate in the plan, they can; if they want to profit from the plan, they can. But they don't have the unilateral right to dump those policies back on the government agencies.

Prior to that, there were about 150 policies that the government was administering directly.

What this amendment would do is called a depopulation amendment. It directs FEMA and the National Flood Insurance Program to take those policies and distribute them among insurance companies who are willing to service those contracts. And I'm happy to report to the Congress and the Members that many mainline insurance companies have agreed to take up these policies.

Out of respect for State Farm agents, many of whom I think were displeased and surprised by their parent company abandoning these policies, it would give them the right to also service those policies. However, there may be some legal problems with that, but we at least don't rule that out.

The depopulation of these policies—and by that, the return to what the program was set up to function like, and that was with private servicers and agents. Handling the policies would be done over a 1-year time frame.

I actually believe that we should have actually depopulated more than we did, but we did this as an accommodation to FEMA and to some of the State Farm agents. I think this is a noncontroversial amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. Sherman and would like to make a few points.

First, I would like to point out that I fully understand and support the goal of encouraging private sector involvement in offering flood insurance and exploring ways to diminish unnecessary reliance on government programs.

However, I am not convinced that this amendment gets us any closer to achieve this goal. In fact, this Amendment may actually put Congress in the position of picking winners and losers in the market place, interfering with private contracts, and creating millions of dollars in new federal spending.

I would like to make the following points:

Regardless of whether a flood insurance policy is provided through NFIP Direct or through a WYO insurer, the federal government is responsible for all losses covered under the policy. Regardless of whether a policy is issued by NFIP Direct of a WYO insurer,

a private company will handle all aspects of policy issuance and claims administration and these services will be paid for through the federal government.

FEMA has informed Congress that private contractors handling NFIP Direct policies can manage the recently transferred policies for \$50 million less each year than WYO carriers. This is a savings of \$250 million for the life of the bill.

Redistribution of these policies destroys consumer choice and dictates to consumers the company and agent they are required to use for flood insurance while taking property from the agents who produce the business. This redistribution affects flood insurance policy holders and insurance agents in every Congressional District across the country.

The only thing this amendment accomplishes is the forcible transfer of policies from one group to another, with absolutely no cost savings and no improvement in customer service.

There are many questions to answer, and I believe the Committee took the right step in requesting a study before acting on the issue. Unfortunately, we seem to be acting today before we have these answers.

I would like to submit the following statements: (1) A summary of the issue provided to the Senate Banking Committee in connection with their hearings on NFIP authorization; and (2) A letter from FEMA to House Financial Services and Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman NEUGEBAUER answering questions about the redistribution amendment and highlighting the increased cost to taxpayers of this amendment.

STATE FARM INSURANCE—JUNE 30, 2011

STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY COMPANY
(STATE FARM) VIEWS ON EFFORTS TO REDISTRIBUTE NFIP DIRECT POLICIES TO WRITE YOUR OWN INSURERS

State Farm supports reauthorizing the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and would like to take this opportunity to clear up any confusion surrounding State Farm's and its agents' participation in the NFIP and the operational differences between flood insurance policies distributed through the Write Your Own (WYO) program and NFIP Direct.

1. The Proposed Redistribution of NFIP Policies Will Not Decrease the Federal Government's Risk

Unfortunately, under the guise of NFIP "reform," the attributes of the WYO and NFIP Direct distribution channels have been mischaracterized in order to pursue an ill-advised scheme to enlist the federal government's powers to take insurance business marketed, solicited, and sold by one group of private insurance agents and redistribute those policies to other agents and companies who had no role in generating these policies in the first instance. There are proprietary rights of insurance agents at stake in this matter.

Characterized as NFIP "depopulation," this scheme hijacks familiar terminology relating to programs used in several states that transfer insurance policies out of state-run insurance pools into the private sector. However, unlike "depopulation" at the state level, where the entire risk of a policy is shifted to the private insurer, the scheme as advocated for NFIP merely redistributes customers, policies, and revenues associated with administering those policies from private businesses connected with NFIP Direct to selected WYO insurers. No changes are made in the risk bearing of companies in the

WYO distribution channel. The federal government retains 100% responsibility for paying all covered flood losses.

Far from being an effort towards privatization reform, the true nature of WYO participation is captured best in the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission filing of a firm that is the largest WYO insurer—Fidelity National Financial, Inc. As described in the firm's most recent Form 10-K for calendar year 2010:

"We earn fees under [the NFIP] program for settling flood claims and administering the program. We serve as administrator and processor in our flood insurance business, and bear none of the underwriting or claims risk. The U.S. federal government is guarantor of flood insurance coverage written under the NFIP and bears the underwriting risk. Revenues from our flood insurance business are impacted by the volume and magnitude of claims processed as well as the volume and rates for policies written. For example, when a large number of claims are processed as a result of a natural disaster, such as a hurricane, we experience an increase in the fees that we receive for settling the claims."

The suggestion that this confiscatory redistribution scheme would shrink the public sector while growing the private sector is wrong. It also completely ignores the fact that, just like the WYO program, NFIP Direct fully utilizes the private sector in handling flood insurance policies.

To be clear:

(1) Regardless of whether a flood insurance policy is provided through NFIP Direct or through a WYO insurer, the policy provides federal insurance coverage and the federal government is responsible for all losses covered under the policy;

(2) NFIP redistribution is a confiscatory scheme that does not diminish federal obligations on a flood insurance policy placed with a WYO insurer;

(3) Whether a policy is issued by NFIP Direct or a WYO insurer, a private company will handle all aspects of policy issuance and claims administration and these services will be paid for through the federal government;

(4) Since NFIP costs are funded entirely with federal monies and FEMA utilizes private parties for handling policies under both the WYO program and NFIP Direct, there are no demonstrated federal savings from redistributing federal flood insurance policies from NFIP Direct to WYO insurers;

(5) Redistribution of NFIP Direct policies to WYO insurers does nothing to increase consumer participation rates which are critical to program solvency; redistribution actually creates disincentives for more than 17,000 agents to increase such participation rates; and

(6) Redistribution destroys consumer choice and dictates to consumers the company and/or agent they are required to use for flood insurance while taking property from the agents who produced the business.

Following is more detailed background information.

II. Background on NFIP

a. The WYO Program and State Farm's Participation

The NFIP program has been in place since 1968. The NFIP's WYO program began in 1983 through statute and federal rule as a financial arrangement between participating property and casualty insurers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The WYO program permits participating property and casualty insurers to sell and service the NFIP's standard flood insurance policies in their own names. Although participating insurance companies receive

an expense allowance for policies written and claims processed, the federal government retains full responsibility for underwriting losses and all premiums paid by purchasers of flood insurance go into the U.S. Treasury. Currently, about 88 insurance companies participate in the WYO arrangement with FEMA; this is a decrease from previous years.

Insurers participate in the program through a WYO Arrangement. FEMA publishes the WYO Arrangement, which is a federal rule, in the Federal Register before the end of August every year. Each WYO insurer considers annually whether or not to sign the WYO arrangement.

State Farm began its WYO participation in 1985. Following its entry in the program, each year State Farm carefully evaluated its continuing participation in the WYO Arrangement. In recent years, NFIP has presented a more challenging landscape of changing requirements and directives which requires the expenditure of resources with varying degrees of notice and clarity of instruction. In addition, the WYO program's continuing existence became more uncertain with each gap in authorizations and there were numerous occasions when the program was allowed to lapse. These situations complicated our ability to serve our customers' needs. Subsequently, State Farm made a very difficult business decision to no longer participate in the WYO Arrangement.

b. Transition to NFIP Direct and Meeting Customer Needs:

Based on existing regulations, State Farm's orderly transfer plan was structured in a way that permitted State Farm agents to continue servicing their customers' needs through NFIP Direct, regardless of whether State Farm itself participated as a WYO insurer. For example, under the Arrangement, a WYO company has the option to sell its book of business to another WYO insurer (subject to FEMA approval) or to transfer policies to the NFIP Direct program. State Farm exercised the option to transfer the policies to the NFIP Direct Program, which avoided the potential for substantial customer confusion and disrupting the relationship customers have with their State Farm agent. More specifically, in utilizing NFIP Direct, the State Farm agent remains the agent of record on transferred policies. This means that State Farm's decision to discontinue participation in the WYO Arrangement did nothing to undermine our exclusive independent contractor agents' ability to continue servicing the needs of their flood insurance customers who maintained or sought federal flood insurance protection in the future. From a consumer perspective, this seamless transition of the policies was effortless; renewal of flood insurance coverage did not require any additional steps by policyholders. The customer placed their coverage as they did previously—through their State Farm agent, an individual who was a familiar face to the customer and had an existing understanding of the customer's property and needs.

State Farm did not receive any compensation for its orderly transfer of policies to NFIP Direct. Of approximately 800,000 policies, State Farm has transferred to date over 550,000 policies. Each State Farm WYO policyholder has already received a notice regarding the transfer plan. Each policyholder has also received or will receive a second notice prior to the policy transfer.

c. The Critical Role of State Farm Agents

Perhaps more important to the functioning of NFIP, active agent participation in the marketing and selling flood insurance is a significant issue of concern to FEMA. It is widely recognized that one major short-

coming of the NFIP is that the purchase of flood insurance is often limited to only those who need coverage or are mandated to purchase coverage in connection with the purchase of a home. This limited demand impedes the ability of the NFIP to broaden its insurance base to satisfy a fundamental tenet of insurance underwriting—spreading the risk of loss among a larger and more diverse pool of policyholders who are unlikely to experience losses at the same time. Consequently, an agent workforce actively engaged in marketing and soliciting NFIP policies is a critical component of making the program more actuarially sound.

Indeed, FEMA recognized that having State Farm agents actively market and sell NFIP Direct policies is a major benefit to the program. However, if the federal government were to redistribute policies brought into NFIP by an agent to another company or agent (which includes commissions), the incentive for agents to originate policies in NFIP Direct would be removed without any commensurate benefit, which would undermine the entire program. Equally pernicious, it would be tantamount to a government taking of business property from individual businessmen and businesswomen solely for the benefit of another private party.

III. Proposed Redistribution Scheme Offers No Cost Advantage: Private Parties Handle the Servicing of all NFIP Policies Regardless of Who Distributes Them

Contrary to the assertions made by supporters of NFIP "depopulation," the confiscatory redistribution of NFIP Direct policies to WYO insurers will not create smaller government, increase the role of the private sector, or diminish the government's risk of loss on flood insurance policies. All NFIP policies have an agent of record that handles the sales and some aspects of servicing. These agents may or may not be associated with a WYO company, but they are paid a commission through NFIP, regardless of whether they are affiliated with a WYO company or not. A similar pattern is followed for claims handling where private sector parties service all NFIP claims regardless of how they are distributed.

Claims handling for NFIP Direct policies is done by a private contractor, Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC), through a competitively bid contract. Furthermore, as described in its own marketing materials, CSC provides identical services to several WYO carriers, including some of the largest. As a result, there is a strong probability that the so-called "reforms" achieved through confiscatory redistribution would do nothing more than transfer the handling of flood insurance policies from CSC under its NFIP Direct hat to CSC wearing its WYO hat. Significantly, the proponents of confiscatory redistribution have not produced any evidence suggesting that their servicing will save the NFIP money. Indeed, the only difference for policies so redistributed would be that insurance agents—primarily small businesspeople who sold the flood policy in the first instance, would see their book of business confiscated by the federal government and simply handed over to another company. This is not reform and is not about "making the government smaller."

IV. Proposed Redistribution Scheme Destroys Consumer Choice

Another insidious result of NFIP confiscatory redistribution is the elimination of consumer choice and engaging the federal government to forcibly require consumers to accept companies and/or agents with whom they have no prior relationship, or, even worse, whom they have affirmatively rejected in the past. Far from creating a seamless transition for consumers, redistribution

generates several problems. For example, if a consumer has chosen to work with an agent and has been with an agent for many years, should the federal government overrule the consumer's choice through redistribution? What if a policy has been redistributed to a company with whom the consumer does not want to do business? Does the consumer have any control? Does the federal government really want to be involved in this type of decision?

V. Conclusion

"Depopulation" of NFIP is a myth. Current efforts along these lines are nothing more than a scheme to use the federal government's authority to redistribute existing policies from one group of private insurance agents and give that business to other private entities. This confiscatory redistribution scheme makes no changes in the federal government's risk exposure under NFIP, fails to increase participation rates in purchasing flood insurance, provides no demonstrated savings to the federal government, and destroys consumer choice. Such measures should be opposed.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2011.

Hon. RANDY NEUGEBAUER,
Chairman, Oversight and Investigations Sub-
committee, Financial Services Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEUGEBAUER: Thank you for your letter of May 23, 2011, in which you requested clarification of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) position on a proposed "depopulation amendment" to H.R. 1309. As a preliminary matter, please accept my assurances that FEMA is committed to administering the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) in a manner that provides affordable insurance combined with a floodplain management program designed to reduce the nation's risk from flood. Since 1983, FEMA has taken advantage of the expertise of the private insurance industry through the Write Your Own (WYO) program, and we remain convinced that a public-private partnership provides the appropriate vehicle for administering the NFIP.

Below are FEMA's responses to your questions.

1. *Please explain in detail how the NFIP plans to expand its ability to administer the additional 800,000 policies which State Farm is ceding to the NFIP program, when it is currently handling approximately 120,000 policies under the NFIP Direct program? What is the anticipated additional annual expense to the program to administer this vastly expanded book of business?*

The NFIP Direct program is administered by a contractor acting as FEMA's servicing agent. That contractor, Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC), has increased its capacity to process the transferred policies by hiring additional staff. State Farm will transfer the policies to NFIP Direct on a monthly basis as they expire. The transition is already underway, with all policies anticipated to be transferred by September 30, 2011.

We estimate that the transfer will reduce NFIP expenses by about \$50 million a year for FY 2012 and subsequent years. During FY 2011 while the policies transition from State Farm to NFIP Direct, the savings will be slightly less. NFIP policyholders and the National Flood Insurance Fund will share the \$50 million in savings. Thirty million dollars of the savings comes from our full-risk policyholders, and the NFIP will pass the savings back to them through slightly lower premiums. We estimate that the average savings per policy will be about \$7, which will be a 1.5% premium reduction. Twenty million

dollars of this savings comes from our subsidized policyholders. By retaining that savings within the NFIP, we can slightly reduce the average amount of the subsidy and there will be more funds available either to pay claims or to reduce the current borrowing.

2. *Does FEMA or the NFIP support, oppose, or take a neutral position with respect to an amendment to HR. 1309, which would have required the NFIP to make the right to service these policies available to other WYO companies, their agents, or to independent agents in a timely, orderly and reasonable manner?*

Without seeing the specific language of the amendment, FEMA would oppose such an amendment unless it allowed, but did not require, the individuals who hold the State Farm policies to move to other companies. Requiring the policies to be transferred to other WYO companies, their agents, or independent agents could harm agents who work with State Farm because State Farm prohibits its agents from working with any other insurance companies, so its agents would have to choose between continuing to work with State Farm or continuing to work with the individuals who hold the State Farm flood insurance policies. FEMA does plan to notify policyholders of their right to voluntarily move from the NFIP Direct program to other companies or agents at the time of policy renewal. We estimate that providing such notifications will cost NFIP over \$900,000 annually.

3. *What, if any, contractual obligations prevent FEMA or the NFIP from making available to the remaining WYO companies the right to service flood insurance policies no longer being serviced by State Farm? If such contracts or agreements exist, please provide a copy to my staff in electronic format.*

State Farm policyholders may move from the NFIP Direct program to a WYO company, and FEMA plans to notify policyholders of that fact at the time of their policy renewals.

Without seeing specific legislative language, FEMA cannot fully assess the nature of the contractual obligations that may be impacted by an amendment. However, to require FEMA to transfer the policies to a WYO company could impact existing contractual obligations.

FEMA has a contractual agreement with the Computer Science Corporation (CSC) to act as its NFIP Direct servicing agent. As the NFIP Direct servicing agent, CSC services flood insurance policies sold directly by FEMA, collects premiums, adjusts and settles claims, and disseminates insurance information to the public, lenders, and agents. Prior to State Farm's decision to terminate its participation in the WYO Program, CSC acted as NFIP Direct servicing agent for approximately 150,000 policies. In March 2011, FEMA competitively awarded a contract to CSC to handle approximately 900,000 State Farm policies that will move to NFIP Direct upon policy renewal. The contract is valid for five years. Because of the increased volume of business now handled by NFIP Direct, FEMA negotiated a 40% per policy discount on the amount charged for each policy handled by CSC through NFIP Direct, which is a significant cost savings to NFIP. Pursuant to the newly-awarded contract, CSC has stepped up its operations, including hiring new employees to assist in servicing the 900,000 new NFIP Direct policies.

Additionally, as explained below, the State Farm insurance agents have contractual obligations that make it difficult to implement a broad-based transfer of policies.

4. *Does NFIP currently possess the legal authority to offer the right to service these policies to the remaining WYO companies, their agents, or independent agents? If so, have there been any efforts on the part of the NFIP to make*

these rights available to these companies or agents? If the NFIP does in fact have such authority, and if there have been no such efforts to utilize that authority to return these rights to the private market, why has NFIP not made these rights available to the remaining WYO companies or agents? Does NFIP intend to make these rights available to the private market?

Once a policy has been transferred to NFIP Direct, FEMA has the authority to allow the policy to be written by participating WYO companies, and typically, policies tend to migrate to WYO companies as those companies compete for the business. FEMA is committed to notifying the insureds in NFIP Direct of the option to take their business elsewhere and has formulated a proposal to provide notice upon policy renewal.

Without seeing the specific language of the amendment, FEMA cannot fully assess the legal implications of such an amendment. However, there are impediments to requiring FEMA to offer the opportunity to service NFIP Direct policies to WYO companies, their agents, or independent agents, particularly with respect to policies that were written by State Farm insurance agents.

When the State Farm policies transfer to NFIP Direct at the time the policies are renewed, State Farm agents will be the agents of record for the policies. While State Farm allows its agents to work with NFIP Direct to provide policyholders with flood insurance, the company prohibits its agents from working with any other private insurance companies. Therefore, State Farm agents would have to choose between continuing to work with State Farm or continuing to work with the approximately 900,000 policyholders who have other lines of insurance with the agents. Moreover, mandating that all, or a certain subset, of NFIP Direct policies be transferred to WYO carriers would harm the agents of record on those policies if those agents are not affiliated with the particular WYO carrier that receives those policies.

Requiring FEMA to offer the opportunity to service NFIP Direct policies to WYO companies, their agents, or independent agents could also create a disincentive to policy renewal and negatively affect the number of policies in force because of the additional steps that would be required to obtain a new carrier and transfer the policy to the new carrier. This may require a policyholder to obtain more than one agent to handle all of their insurance needs. Additionally, such a provision could limit individual citizens' right to choose their insurance agent because some policyholders may not be able to work with their current agents if those agents are not affiliated with the particular WYO carriers that received the policyholder's business from the NFIP Direct.

Although the NFIP has not transferred NFIP Direct policies to the WYO insurers, their agents, or independent insurance agents for the reasons provided above, the NFIP intends to advise NFIP Direct policyholders of the option to move their policies to another WYO carrier or to continue with NFIP Direct at the time their policies are renewed. This notification will inform policyholders that they have a choice about who handles their business, while allowing the policyholders' current agents the opportunity to compete to retain that business.

I trust that this information is helpful. If you have further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Legislative Affairs at Division.

Sincerely,

EDWARD L. CONNOR,
Deputy Federal Insurance and
Mitigation Administration Insurance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1610

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. LOEBSACK. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 57, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 21. APPEALS.

(a) TELEVISION AND RADIO ANNOUNCEMENT.—Section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after “determinations” by inserting the following: “by notifying a local television and radio station.”; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and shall notify a local television and radio station at least once during the same 10-day period”.

(b) EXTENSION OF APPEALS PERIOD.—Subsection (b) of section 1363 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(b) The Director” and inserting “(b)(1) The Administrator”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The Administrator shall grant an extension of the 90-day period for appeals referred to in paragraph (1) for 90 additional days if an affected community certifies to the Administrator, after the expiration of at least 60 days of such period, that the community—

“(A) believes there are property owners or lessees in the community who are unaware of such period for appeals; and

“(B) will utilize the extension under this paragraph to notify property owners or lessees who are affected by the proposed flood elevation determinations of the period for appeals and the opportunity to appeal the determinations proposed by the Administrator.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to any flood elevation determination for any area in a community that has not, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, been issued a Letter of Final Determination for such determination under the flood insurance map modernization process.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Congresswoman BIGGERT for bringing this bill to the floor. I look forward to supporting this important legislation that will address many of the issues I have been experi-

encing in my district, and ones that I know are occurring all across the country.

In Iowa, we are all too familiar with the flood insurance program because of the devastating floods of 2008, and again on the Missouri River in western Iowa this summer. We also have many communities throughout the State going through the mapping process. Unfortunately, due to a lack of adequate notification during the process of flood mapping, many homeowners continue to be surprised when they find out that their homes are newly placed in a floodplain and they will be required to purchase flood insurance.

My amendment will help ensure communities and property owners that are affected by new maps are made aware of the process taking place from the beginning. Currently, FEMA is only required to publish notice of new flood elevations in a local newspaper. For one community in my district, this translated literally to a paragraph in the legal notice section. My amendment will require FEMA to notify not only the local paper, but also a local television and radio station, because I think it's time we update this law to be more reflective of all the media our constituents use daily.

Ensuring communities have the information needed at the beginning is one step. The next is ensuring that there is appropriate time and ability for communities and property owners to appeal the drafts. Currently, there is a 90-day appeal period for property owners to dispute FEMA's draft maps. Many property owners don't find out this process is taking place until after the map is finalized, meaning the 90-day appeal period has long passed, and they no longer have the ability to ensure their houses are not included in the final map in error.

My amendment ensures that communities and property owners have an additional 90 days to appeal the draft maps if they weren't aware of the original appeal period and believe there are property owners that haven't been made aware of the appeals process already.

I think we can all agree that every property owner who might be affected by flood maps should have an opportunity to fully participate in the established process, and that we should strive to have the most accurate maps possible. My amendment will ensure that homeowners have the information they need to make informed decisions and preparations at the beginning of the process and fully participate in the existing appeals process.

The more homeowners that are aware of flood maps, the more participation there is in the process, in the program; and the more accurate our maps will be. Greater map accuracy will give us better awareness of the flood risks in our communities and allow homeowners and community leaders alike to take steps to mitigate and prepare for that risk.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment on behalf of property owners in all of our districts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think that proper and effective notification by FEMA allows the protection provided by the NFIP to reach out to those who need it. And the amendment also includes provisions designed to benefit communities that believe that they have been incorrectly mapped in the flood program, further enhancing the validity of the maps by providing an appeal for newly mapped areas. I support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Again, I thank Mrs. BIGGERT for her support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. I would like to commend Mr. LOEBSACK for his amendment. I also would like to say that because it does require or ask that TV and radio be utilized to get the word out, the next amendment by the lady from Michigan actually would—and I have taken no position on her amendment—but it actually asks that national flood insurance not incur advertising expenses. And I think there is some good points to that, some bad points. But as this amendment proves, the local stations themselves and the local media can get these things out. So that might be a point in favor of her first amendment.

I am very opposed to her second amendment. I don't want the Members to confuse support, or at least non-opposition to her first amendment, as support for her second. But I commend the gentleman, and I think it's a good sense amendment and would urge strong support to the Loeb sack amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I thank the distinguished sponsor and would preface my comments by saying I am strongly in support of Congresswoman BIGGERT's superb piece of legislation.

However, I rise today in opposition to this amendment offered by Representative SHERMAN. I would like to point out first that I fully understand and support the goal of encouraging private sector involvement and exploring ways to diminish unnecessary reliance on government programs. However, I am not convinced, in fact I am unconvinced, this amendment gets us any

closer to achieving that goal. In fact, this amendment may put Congress in the position of choosing winners and losers in the marketplace, interfering with private contracts, and creating millions of dollars in new Federal spending.

I would like to make the following points: regardless of whether a flood insurance policy is provided through NFIP Direct or WIO, the Federal Government's responsible for all the losses incurred under the policy. FEMA has informed Congress that private contractors handling NFIP Direct policies can manage the recently transferred policies for \$50 million less, which is a saving of \$250 million over the life of the bill. I don't have to tell any individuals in today's world what that means.

Redistribution of these policies destroys, in my judgment, consumer choice, dictates to consumers the company and agent they are required to use for flood insurance, while taking property from the agents who produce the business. This redistribution affects flood insurance policyholders and insurance agents in every district in the country.

Really, the only thing this amendment does is the forcible transfer of policies from one group to the other with not only no cost savings, with significant costs to the Federal Government. A lot of questions to answer.

I believe the committee and Representative BIGGERT took the right approach in requesting a study before acting on the issue. Unfortunately, today, we seem to be acting contrary-wise before we have these answers. With all due respect again to the sponsor of the amendment, and certainly in concert with the sponsor of the bill, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. I think the gentleman from Illinois was arguing on the last amendment, not this amendment. If the Members will take everything he said, transfer it to the amendment before, it would be appropriate. But I disagree with his argument.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1620

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 57, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 21. RESERVE FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by inserting after section 1310 (42 U.S.C. 4017) the following new section:

"SEC. 1310A. RESERVE FUND.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE FUND.—In carrying out the flood insurance program authorized by this title, the Administrator shall establish in the Treasury of the United States a National Flood Insurance Reserve Fund (in this section referred to as the 'Reserve Fund') which shall—

"(1) be an account separate from any other accounts or funds available to the Administrator; and

"(2) be available for meeting the expected future obligations of the flood insurance program.

"(b) RESERVE RATIO.—Subject to the phase-in requirements under subsection (d), the Reserve Fund shall maintain a balance equal to—

"(1) 1 percent of the sum of the total potential loss exposure of all outstanding flood insurance policies in force in the prior fiscal year; or

"(2) such higher percentage as the Administrator determines to be appropriate, taking into consideration any circumstance that may raise a significant risk of substantial future losses to the Reserve Fund.

"(c) MAINTENANCE OF RESERVE RATIO.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall have the authority to establish, increase, or decrease the amount of aggregate annual insurance premiums to be collected for any fiscal year necessary—

"(A) to maintain the reserve ratio required under subsection (b); and

"(B) to achieve such reserve ratio, if the actual balance of such reserve is below the amount required under subsection (b).

"(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consider—

"(A) the expected operating expenses of the Reserve Fund;

"(B) the insurance loss expenditures under the flood insurance program;

"(C) any investment income generated under the flood insurance program; and

"(D) any other factor that the Administrator determines appropriate.

"(3) LIMITATIONS.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act, including any provisions relating to chargeable premium rates and annual increases of such rates.

"(d) PHASE-IN REQUIREMENTS.—The phase-in requirements under this subsection are as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in fiscal year 2012 and not ending until the fiscal year in which the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, in each such fiscal year the Administrator shall place in the Reserve Fund an amount equal to not less than 7.5 percent of the reserve ratio required under subsection (b).

"(2) AMOUNT SATISFIED.—As soon as the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, and except as provided in paragraph (3), the Administrator shall not be required to set aside any amounts for the Reserve Fund.

"(3) EXCEPTION.—If at any time after the ratio required under subsection (b) is achieved, the Reserve Fund falls below the required ratio under subsection (b), the Administrator shall place in the Reserve Fund for that fiscal year an amount equal to not less than 7.5 percent of the reserve ratio required under subsection (b).

"(e) LIMITATION ON RESERVE RATIO.—In any given fiscal year, if the Administrator deter-

mines that the reserve ratio required under subsection (b) cannot be achieved, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress that—

"(1) describes and details the specific concerns of the Administrator regarding such consequences;

"(2) demonstrates how such consequences would harm the long-term financial soundness of the flood insurance program; and

"(3) indicates the maximum attainable reserve ratio for that particular fiscal year.

"(f) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—The reserve ratio requirements under subsection (b) and the phase-in requirements under subsection (d) shall be subject to the availability of amounts in the National Flood Insurance Fund for transfer under section 1310(a)(10), as provided in section 1310(f)."

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (a) of section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) for transfers to the National Flood Insurance Reserve Fund under section 1310A, in accordance with such section."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank Chairwoman BIGGERT for her hard work on this bill and the ranking member, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and the gentlewoman from California, who is the overseer of this program.

This amendment is a forward thinking amendment to put the flood insurance program on sound footing. Consider this amendment the national flood insurance emergency fund. Currently premiums come in, payments go out, but nothing is reserved for the events that no one can predict.

Claims are paid with existing premiums and everyone crosses their fingers that nothing really bad happens.

If incoming premiums are not enough, then the National Flood Insurance Program has no other option than to ask for a bailout.

In fact, the NFIP program has carried debt in 18 of the past 30 years. Most interesting of all is that not all of these years saw catastrophic flooding. FEMA just didn't do a good job managing premiums and claims. It's clear that in good years and in bad the flood insurance program does not have a good grasp on how much they will pay out in claims.

However, when catastrophic flooding does happen, the NFIP program is even less prepared for the claims. The year of 2005 was one of those years that nobody could predict. Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma together cost \$17 billion in losses for the National Flood Insurance Program. Six years later, including principal and interest, the NFIP debt is now \$18 billion.

Every year it seems like flooding impacts a wide swath of the United

States, and 2011 has been no different. No one can predict the weather. What NFIP needs is the ability to save up to help smooth out those unpredictable years. If the program could stash money away in good times, it would have money to pay for the years when the estimates were incorrect.

My amendment does just that. It establishes a reserve fund in NFIP. This is just common sense, so much so, NFIP is one of the few Federal funds that does not have a reserve fund. FHA has a 2 percent reserve requirement. The FDIC deposit insurance fund is required to have a 1.35 percent reserve ratio.

Now I want to take a moment to address some of the possible concerns with the amendment.

First, this amendment does not expand the NFIP to other catastrophic events, like earthquakes or tornados. This fund and the bill remains specific to flooding.

Second, the administrator gets the funds from the existing premiums. The administrator and this amendment are bound to adhere to the parameters established in the underlying bill on premium rates and annual increases.

Third, this amendment does not take away from debt repayment. Any premium collected would be spent to cover losses because the program is running up the deficit. This takes precedent.

At some point in the future, the program might be able to collect enough to cover all costs and set aside a reserve. But given the magnitude of the current debt, this is not likely to occur in the short-term.

Finally, this amendment does not stand in the way of reinsurance opportunity for the flood program. I support reinsurance for the flood program and firmly believe that both reinsurance and a reserve fund can coexist.

In fact, many private insurers reserve for losses and purchase reinsurance. Private insurers will use reserve funds as a deductible for reinsurance coverage.

However, I fundamentally believe that as long as taxpayers are involved, it's an ultimate backstop. This program needs a reserve. It is not responsible to tell taxpayers no more bailouts but offer no solution to the ongoing bailout of NFIP.

If there is no reserve fund, there will be more bailouts. It is just a matter of when.

Adopting this amendment would address a fundamental deficiency in the program that is ripe for bailouts. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

In drafting this bill, the chairwoman and I sought to strike the right balance

between protecting homeowners and strengthening the flood insurance program. I believe that the bill before us today does just that.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that the gentleman's amendment strikes the same balance. Specifically, by creating a reserve fund, the gentleman's amendment would allow the NFIP to increase insurance premiums on homeowners.

So regardless of their flood risk, homeowners will have to pay more in order to fund a reserve fund that will never have enough money to pay out claims for catastrophic events. This isn't fair to our taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, and, in fact, would stall the already slow recovery of the housing market.

I understand the problem that the gentleman is attempting to solve. We all know that the flood insurance program is over \$17 billion in debt due to claims resulting from Hurricane Katrina.

However, I think we have to be clear that Hurricane Katrina was a catastrophic, once in a lifetime event. Prior to Katrina, the flood insurance program operated completely in the black.

In addition, I believe that the bill contains many provisions that would allow the flood insurance program to reform its premium structure so that it can collect the premiums it needs to pay out claims. For example, the bill ends subsidies for 350,000 pre-FIRM properties, including second homes, commercial properties, homes with new owners, homes substantially damaged or improved, and homes with repetitive claims.

By making these properties pay actuarial rates that reflect their full risk, the bill would make these properties pay their fair share, thereby increasing the amount of funding to the flood insurance fund.

Mr. Chairman, while I believe that the gentleman's amendment is very well intended, I believe that it is unnecessary given the strong reforms in this bill and the potential problems it may cause for homeowners, particularly those that have been phased into actuarial rates.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment and I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentlewoman's opinion, and I know that she is very familiar with this program, but I don't think a reserve fund would cost anybody any additional money. It does not go up on premiums. The premium amount stays the same.

This is a rainy day thing, excuse the pun, a fund that would be there. It would not even be started until this current \$18 billion in debt is paid off. But we are fooling ourselves if we think that we can predict the weather, if we think we know when Katrina or Rita or Wilma is going to come.

This fund would only be established after the debt is repaid, and so it's a very commonsense measure to have this reserve fund, as many other government agencies do.

With that, I would ask for a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 64, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 23. TERMINATION OF BROADCAST PERSONIFIED FLOOD INSURANCE COMMERCIALS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may not, after the date of the enactment of this Act, obligate any amounts for purchasing time or space for any advertisement or commercial for flood insurance coverage under the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.). This subsection may not be construed to prohibit obligation of amounts for dissemination of information regarding such program to holders of flood insurance policies under such program.

(b) REDUCTION OF NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND DEBT.—Any amounts made available to the Administrator and allocated for advertising or commercials described in subsection (a) that remain unobligated on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be used only for reducing the debt of the National Flood Insurance Fund incurred pursuant to the authority under section 1309 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment that would end TV and radio ads that I believe to be a total waste of taxpayers' dollars. Over the past 2 years FEMA has actually spent over half a million dollars on the production of what they called "Home Personified flood insurance commercials." These slick commercials sort of depict actors with roofs hovering over their heads talking about the need to

obtain flood insurance, and about the fact that one in four homes are in a high-risk flood zone, and they pitch to contact FEMA for a free brochure about the program.

□ 1630

These commercials between April of 2010 and April of 2011 cost over \$7 million in airtime to broadcast all across the 50 States, and they are slated to be aired for an additional year at least. Seven million dollars spent on promoting the National Flood Insurance Program, which is a federally mandated flood program, which has been mentioned all across the day here, is already almost \$18 billion in debt. I would say, why not spend that \$7 million to pay back the American taxpayers? Or better yet, to begin paying off the program's \$18 billion in debt?

Mr. Chairman, last year in the election in the fall, the American people sent a very clear message to Washington. And I don't think the message to Congress here was urging us to spend millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on TV commercials asking them to put money into a failing, bloated, and completely unnecessary government program. No, they were demanding that we get a grip on government spending, on out-of-control government spending, and they were asking us to end programs where the government is trying to fill a role best done by the private sector.

Shortly, Mr. Chairman, all of us in this House, in the Congress, in both Chambers, are going to be asked to raise the national debt limit because we have not been able to get our fiscal house in order. And this week, here we are being asked to renew a Federal program that is over \$17 billion in debt currently, all of which falls on the backs of the American taxpayers, and we need to raise the debt ceiling of the flood insurance program, as well, to almost \$25 billion. Who cares? I guess it's just taxpayers' money.

If we want to stop adding to our national debt, we should not continue the Federal flood insurance program—and I'm going to be offering an amendment to that in a moment—nor should we continue to spend millions each year on TV commercials for a program that constituents in many, many States, most of the States across the Nation, are wondering about, at a minimum, and many of them are outraged. I certainly hear from my constituents back in Michigan who are looking for some relief. These hard-pressed taxpayers from my State are asking for less spending, for less government, for lower taxes and less government intrusion into their lives. They're certainly not asking us for wasteful government programs to be shoved down their throats on television with television ads.

My amendment today, Mr. Chairman, to end unnecessary spending on TV commercials for the National Flood Insurance Program will be a downpay-

ment on the relief that we owe to the American taxpayers who are concerned about these commercials that seem to be on repeat all across the airwaves in all of the States across our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that my colleagues support this amendment today and vote in favor of saving money, taxpayers' money, for the American taxpayers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

The gentlewoman's amendment would prohibit FEMA from spending any funds on television or radio commercials to promote the purchase of flood insurance.

Floods are the most common natural disaster in the United States. Unfortunately, even areas that aren't in floodplains experience floods sometimes. When that happens, the Federal Government provides aid to those homeowners and communities, and it is the taxpayer who pays for that aid.

Under the National Flood Insurance Program, insurance premiums pay for the cost of flood damage. Therefore, if homeowners outside floodplains buy flood insurance, taxpayers won't be on the hook if their properties flood. However, in order to have these homeowners buy flood insurance, they have to learn about the program and its benefits to them. This is where radio and television advertising are helpful—essential, that is. The ads reach a wide audience and present clear facts about the availability and affordability of flood insurance.

To take away FEMA's ability to let the people know what's available to them would actually place the millions of Americans who choose and are not required to purchase flood insurance at risk. Given these times of record deficits, this is simply irresponsible. That is why I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would simply observe that, for the most part, the reason that folks, property owners, get national flood insurance is because the Federal Government holds a gun to their heads and says that you cannot get a federally backed mortgage unless you buy Federal national flood insurance through the National Flood Insurance Program. So I don't think we have to spend millions and millions of dollars to convince them to do something that, in my mind, I question whether it is even constitutional that we are forcing people to do this kind of a thing; but I certainly don't think we need to spend millions of dollars to notify them of something that we are mandating for them.

Certainly if you live in a flood-prone area, you probably know it. And with everything going on in the Nation, I just can't believe we're wasting money like this. And I would certainly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, when the gentlewoman offered her views during the general discussion, she certainly does not join with her colleagues who have joined with us in a bipartisan way to produce a bill that is in the best interests of all of the citizens of this country. As a matter of fact, I have referred to her views on this issue as rather radical. I think that for us to have an insurance program that allows participation by the average citizen so that they can be in a position to make themselves whole after a disaster, to basically repair their homes, to replace their furnishings, and to basically have a way of continuing a decent quality of life is not too much to ask of your government.

So I would oppose this amendment and consider this amendment also just as radical. To say that you have a program but you can't tell anybody about it simply does not make good sense.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 70, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 27. STUDY OF ALL-PERIL INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine various means and methods by which a market could be established, and the effectiveness and feasibility of each such means and method, for providing all-peril insurance coverage for residential properties. Such study shall analyze and determine, for only residential properties with mortgages insured under the FHA mortgage insurance programs of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and for all residential properties—

(1) whether a viable insurance market could be established, including by establishment of a Federal program for reinsurance for such all-peril insurance coverage and by other means and methods;

(2) the effects of each such means and method of establishing such a market in facilitating and encouraging the private insurance market to develop and offer all-peril insurance products for residential properties;

(3) the cost of such all-peril insurance coverage for various types of residential properties; and

(4) the effects that requiring such insurance coverage would have on prices for existing housing and for housing constructed in the future.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report describing the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a) and the analysis conducted under such study, and setting forth the results and determinations of the study.

(c) ALL-PERIL INSURANCE.—For purposes of this section, the term “all-peril insurance” means, with respect a residential property, insurance coverage meeting the following requirements:

(1) SUBSTANTIAL DEDUCTIBLE.—The coverage is made available subject to a substantial deductible in relation to the amount of coverage provided.

(2) COVERED LOSSES.—The coverage covers only damage and losses to the property that—

(A) render the property uninhabitable or substantially impair the habitability of the property; and

(B) result from any of the following hazards—

(i) movement of the earth, including earthquakes, shockwaves, sinkholes, landslides, and mudflows;

(ii) water damage, including floods, sewer back-ups, and water seepage through the foundation;

(iii) war, including undeclared war and civil war;

(iv) nuclear hazards, including explosion of nuclear devices and nuclear reactor accidents;

(v) governmental action, including the destruction, confiscation, or seizure of covered property by any governmental or public authority; or

(vi) bad repair or workmanship on a property, use of faulty construction materials in a property, or defective maintenance to a property.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today to propose what I believe would be a proactive solution for homeowners when they face unforeseen disasters. My amendment will simply ask the GAO to report to Congress the means and effects of facilitating a market for all-peril insurance policies. This amendment comes directly from an issue faced by many of my constituents and in nearly 4,000 households around the country—problems associated with the unforeseen disaster caused by the use of toxic Chinese drywall.

Over the last 5 years, nearly 4,000 homes in over 40 States have been discovered to contain toxic Chinese

drywall. This drywall has been tested by the Consumer Product Safety Commission and has been found to be responsible for hazardous chemicals oozing into these homes. Americans living in these homes have experienced everything from cold and flu-like symptoms to migraine headaches, chronic nosebleeds, gastrointestinal problems, and other debilitating symptoms.

Homeowners with homes tainted with toxic drywall have had the expectation that the costs associated with remediating their home would be covered by their homeowner's insurance policy. But virtually all of their policies exclude from coverage many of the different classes of damages. In the case of Chinese drywall, a standard homeowner's policy does not cover “losses to property resulting from faulty zoning, bad repair or workmanship, faulty construction materials, or defective maintenance.” And so these families are stuck with paying mortgages and have homes that are essentially uninhabitable.

This problem is not limited to just Chinese drywall. In the aftermath of hurricanes, many homeowners discover that they are not covered for water damage and frequently have to argue whether or not their home was destroyed by water or by wind. Sinkholes, which are normally associated with areas with histories of mining or seismic activity are springing up outside of these typical areas, and homeowners are learning the hard way that they are not covered by damages caused by them.

I believe that homeowners need all-peril insurance, insurance that covers homeowners from catastrophic losses regardless of cause, provided, of course, that the homeowners did not cause the loss themselves.

□ 1640

All-peril plans would be supplemental insurance policies that would cover losses resulting from any of the causes currently excluded from the standard homeowners policy. These policies could be limited to catastrophic losses and provide for substantial deductibles and possibly only cover losses that rendered a property uninhabitable.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would direct the GAO to fully study the implications of an all-peril policy. Why can't a policy be bought now? Is there no interest in it? Could the Federal Government successfully market the plans with the private sector? I feel that answers to these questions are needed.

What we do know is that when circumstances beyond a homeowner's control make a home uninhabitable, the last thing they want to do is look through a policy and find that their completely destroyed home isn't protected by the insurance policy that they bought. It is for this reason that I offer the amendment, Mr. Chairman, for a GAO study and ask that the amendment be adopted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment, which would direct the GAO to conduct a study on all-peril insurance policies for residential properties, to me really expands beyond the scope of this bill.

Fundamental reform of the National Flood Insurance Program should be the priority of this Congress, including the removal of subsidies over time to improve the long-term solvency of the program. In contrast, the Scott amendment would dramatically increase the scope at a time when government insurance programs, such as the NFIP, are essentially insolvent and remain grossly underfunded.

If the gentleman would like to have an all-peril study, he has the option to write a letter to the GAO and request such a study, and that will be done, but to tie it into the flood insurance makes it seem like we're going to expand the flood insurance when we're really trying to decrease the expansion and really to bring in the private sector to do this. I really think that this is way beyond what we should be doing.

His amendment would pave the way to expand the Federal Government's role in the private insurance market by creating a massive new program to offer government-provided coverage backed by taxpayer dollars against property losses. If the gentleman is really interested in the drywall particularly, this is something that he can ask for a study on that, and it really should not be within the scope of this bill.

I would urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this study would not affect the underlying provisions of the bill. The priorities of the bill remain the priorities of the bill. This would just affect the situation where people find their homes uninhabitable and are looking for help.

This does not have to be a government program. The GAO could recommend that it could be a private program and possibly get out of the flood insurance business altogether if it covered all perils.

I would hope that we would at least study the issue to see if it is feasible. Anybody who has talked to people with Chinese drywall and find that their house is uninhabitable, they're paying their mortgage, they don't have anywhere to go, they can't afford another mortgage, and their insurance policy that they paid premiums for every

month, month after month after month, doesn't cover anything. I think if you're buying insurance, it ought to insure you for unforeseen circumstances, and that is what this study would provide.

I hope you would adopt the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield back the balance of my time and request a "no" vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 112-138.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Flood Insurance Program Termination Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE COVERAGE.—Effective January 1, 2012, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this section referred to as the "Administrator") shall not provide any new flood insurance coverage, or renew any coverage provided before such date, under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(b) TREATMENT OF EXISTING COVERAGE.—Subsection (a) shall not—

(1) affect any flood insurance coverage provided under such Act under a contract or agreement entered into before the date specified in such subsection and, notwithstanding the repeals under section 3, such provisions as in effect immediately before such repeal shall continue to apply with respect to flood insurance coverage in force after such repeal; or

(2) require the termination of any contract or other agreement for flood insurance coverage entered into before such date.

(c) WIND-UP.—After the date specified in subsection (a), the Administrator shall take such actions as may be necessary steps to wind up the affairs of the National Flood Insurance Program.

(d) TREATMENT OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the National Flood Insurance Fund established under section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017) shall be available to the Administrator for performing the functions of the Administrator with respect to flood insurance coverage remaining in force after the date specified in subsection (a). Upon the expiration of the

contracts and agreements for such coverage, any unexpended balances in such Fund shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) TREATMENT OF PRIOR DETERMINATIONS.—The repeals made by section 3 of the provisions of law specified in such section shall not affect any order, determination, regulation, or contract that has been issued, made, or allowed to become effective under such provisions before the effective date of the repeal. All such orders, determinations, regulations, and contracts shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by the President, the Administrator, or other authorized official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(2) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—

(A) EFFECT ON PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—The repeals made by section 3 shall not affect any proceedings relating to the National Flood Insurance Program, including notices of proposed rulemaking, pending on the effective date of the repeals, before the Federal Emergency Management Agency, except that no assistance or flood insurance coverage may be provided pursuant to any application pending on such effective date. Such proceedings, to the extent that they relate to functions performed by the Administrator after such repeal, shall be continued. Orders shall be issued in such proceedings, appeals shall be taken therefrom, and payments shall be made pursuant to such orders, as if this Act had not been enacted; and orders issued in any such proceedings shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or revoked by the Administrator, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the discontinuance or modification of any proceeding described in subparagraph (A) under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such proceeding could have been discontinued or modified if this section had not been enacted.

(3) ACTIONS.—This section shall not affect suits commenced before the effective date of the repeals made by section 3, and in all such suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and effect as if this section had not been enacted.

(4) LIABILITIES INCURRED.—No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against an individual in the official capacity of such individual as an officer of the Federal Emergency Management Agency having any responsibility for the National Flood Insurance Program shall abate by reason of the enactment of this section. No cause of action relating to such Program, by or against the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or by or against any officer thereof in the official capacity of such officer having any responsibility for such program, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND CONTINUATION OF FEMA MAPPING RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.—The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) by striking section 1302 (42 U.S.C. 4001);

(2) by striking chapters I and II (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.);

(3) in section 1360 (42 U.S.C. 4101)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "until the date specified in section 1319";

(B) by striking subsection (d);

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) by striking "To promote compliance with the requirements of this title, the" and inserting "The";

(ii) by striking "directly responsible for coordinating the national flood insurance program";

(iii) in the last sentence, by striking "National Flood Insurance Fund, pursuant to section 1310(b)(6)" and inserting the following: "General Fund of the Treasury and shall be used only for reducing the budget deficit of the Federal Government"; and

(D) in subsection (i)—

(i) by striking "free of charge" and inserting "at cost";

(ii) by striking "and States and communities participating in the national flood insurance program pursuant to section 1310 and at cost to all other" and inserting "States and communities, and other interested"; and

(iii) in the he last sentence, by striking "National Flood Insurance Fund, pursuant to section 1310(b)(6)" and inserting the following: "General Fund of the Treasury and shall be used only for reducing the budget deficit of the Federal Government";

(4) by striking sections 1361A (42 U.S.C. 4102a);

(5) in section 1363(e) (42 U.S.C. 4104(e)), by striking the third and fifth sentences; and

(6) in section 1364 (42 U.S.C. 4104a)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking "or the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973" each place such term appears; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

"(B) a statement that flood insurance coverage may be available in the private market or through a State-sponsored program; and";

(II) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(B) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(7) in section 1365 (42 U.S.C. 4104b)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "and in which flood insurance under this title is available"; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1); and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking "the community identification number and community participation status (for purposes of the national flood insurance program) of the community in which the improved real estate or such property is located."; and

(II) in the third sentence, by striking "because the building or mobile home is not located in a community that is participating in the national flood insurance program or";

(8) by striking sections 1366 and 1367 (42 U.S.C. 4104c, 4104d);

(9) in section 1370 (42 U.S.C. 4121)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (7), (14), and (15);

(B) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting "and";

(C) in paragraph (13), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13), as so amended, as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively;

(10) by striking sections 1371 through 1375 (42 U.S.C. 4122-26);

(11) in section 1376 (42 U.S.C. 4127)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "to carry out this title" and all that follows through the end of paragraph (3) and inserting "to carry out the mapping, studies, investigations, and other responsibilities of the Director under this title"; and

(B) by striking subsection (c); and

(12) by striking section 1377 (42 U.S.C. 4001 note).

(b) FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973.—The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 is amended—

- (1) by striking section 2 (42 U.S.C. 4002);
 (2) by striking section 102 (42 U.S.C. 4012a);
 (3) in section 201 (42 U.S.C. 4105)—

(A) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(a) As information becomes available to the Director concerning the existence of flood hazards, the Director shall publish information in accordance with section 1360(a)(1) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and shall notify the chief executive officer of each known flood-prone community of its tentative identification as a community containing one or more areas having special flood hazards.”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “shall either (1) promptly make proper application to participate in the national flood insurance program or (2)” and inserting “may”;

(C) by striking subsections (c) and (d);

(D) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (c); and

(4) by striking section 202 (42 U.S.C. 4106).

(c) BUNNING-BEREUTER-BLUMENAUER FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2004.—Title II of the Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 4011 note).

(d) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 1994.—The National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 is amended by striking sections 561 (42 U.S.C. 4011 note), 562 (42 U.S.C. 4102 note), 578 (42 U.S.C. 4014 note), 579(b), and 582 (42 U.S.C. 5154a).

(e) FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956.—Section 15 of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 2414) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2012.

SEC. 4. INTERSTATE COMPACTS FOR FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT.—The consent of the Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to enter into agreement or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for making available to interested persons insurance coverage against loss resulting from physical damage to or loss of real property or personal property related thereto arising from any flood occurring in the United States.

(b) RIGHTS RESERVED.—The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or consent granted by this section, is expressly reserved to the Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 340, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would begin by asking a very fundamental question: Why in the world is the Federal Government in the flood insurance business? Really, I do not understand it.

I don't think anyone should be surprised to learn that the Federal Government is not a very good insurance agent, that they run a terrible insurance program, as evidenced by the \$18 billion in debt that the NFIP, the National Flood Insurance Program, has racked up over the years and will probably never repay. I don't think they'll ever repay it. If you don't believe me, you can consider the testimony that the administrator of FEMA made before the Financial Services Committee.

In congressional testimony, he said the program will likely always be in debt, massive debt.

Congress set up the NFIP to ostensibly be an insurance company, but it is not held to the same standards as private insurance companies. Instead of holding cash reserves, the NFIP has a bottomless pit of money that it shamelessly taps into. That money pit is also known as the U.S. Treasury, or the American taxpayers. If the NFIP were a private insurance company, it would have gone bankrupt years ago, or it would have been in need of a Federal bailout. In other words, when this government-authorized Ponzi scheme runs out of money, it simply gets more by dipping into the pockets of taxpayers. Mr. Chairman, I would say that this is a program that would make Bernie Madoff blush.

The American people are fed up with bailouts, and this bill is just that: another bailout for another broken program. If we want to stop adding to our national debt, we should not continue the Federal flood insurance program.

My home State of Michigan is just one of a majority of States that is actually disadvantaged by this Ponzi scheme. The State House of Representatives has recently passed a resolution condemning the NFIP as fundamentally flawed and unfair, and I would expect the State Senate to follow suit shortly. So there is an entire State. I don't think that's radical.

My amendment would actually end the program at the end of this year and allow States to work together to form a regional coalition to shape insurance policies that meet the needs of their particular State. There is no way that a one-size-fits-all insurance program that dramatically subsidizes rates in some of the most flood-prone areas of our Nation while at the same time forcing those in less flood-prone areas to pay much higher rates can be sustained. States like mine will simply become fed up and opt out, which is what's going to happen, so that they can better protect their citizens. Then, of course, it would force this program even deeper into debt. It is time to end this program now.

My amendment would also, and perhaps more importantly, allow the private market to get into the flood insurance business without the Federal Government's unfair competition of politically based premiums, which would allow premiums to be set based on actual risk.

If you want to get a handle on out-of-control Federal spending and start eliminating government programs that do nothing except enforce bad policy and recklessly spend the taxpayers' money, I would ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

A RESOLUTION TO MEMORIALIZE THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO MAKE SIGNIFICANT REFORMS TO THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Whereas, Under the National Flood Insurance Program, most property owners must

purchase flood insurance if their property is located within a mapped floodplain; and

Whereas, The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has recently revised existing floodplain maps in Michigan that, in many cases, have increased the amount of land within the floodplain without adequate explanation of perceived additional flood risk. Flood insurance for buildings within redrawn areas is a significant added expense. These revisions amount to a penalty that will be felt far into the future, especially as the market value of impacted properties suffers needlessly; and

Whereas, The revised maps exacerbate disparities between the premiums paid by Michigan residents relative to claims received. Michigan residents have paid nearly five times as much in flood insurance premiums than they have received back in claims over the last 30 years. The remaining funds from these premiums goes to subsidize flood insurance claims in higher risk areas of the country; and

Whereas, The National Flood Insurance Program is operated without transparency to the public in rate-setting methods. Rebuilding within a floodplain has continued in higher risk areas of the country where multiple recent flood events have occurred, contributing to the \$20 billion in debt of the National Flood Insurance Program. Rebuilding in very high risk areas would be avoided if flood insurance was set at actuarially sound rates; and

Whereas, The National Flood Insurance Program is fundamentally flawed and unfair. Year after year, the program takes money from property owners in most states and uses that money to rebuild in only a few states. Congresswoman Candice Miller has introduced legislation (H.R. 435) to eliminate the National Flood Insurance Program in 2013 and to authorize states to work together to provide flood insurance as they deem appropriate; and

Whereas, Congresswoman Judy Biggert has introduced legislation, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011 (H.R. 1309), to begin the process of modernizing and reforming the National Flood Insurance Program; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to make significant reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, June 21, 2011.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

The gentlewoman's amendment would terminate entirely the flood insurance program, which provides much needed insurance for 5.5 million homeowners. The flood insurance program was created in 1968 after record flooding led the private insurance industry to stop writing flood policies. The private sector didn't want to write these policies because floods are very common and very expensive. However, the Federal Government didn't want to

simply write a blank check for homeowners every time it flooded. This is why the flood insurance program was created.

□ 1650

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Illinois, Chairwoman BIGGERT, who has worked so hard on this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Illinois will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I know we have had quite a bit of discussion about this already, but maybe we will bring this to a close with this amendment, for a while anyway.

Let me just say that the underlying bill really doesn't ask for additional borrowing authority. In fact, the reforms in the underlying bill will accelerate the ability of NFIP to pay down its debt. This bill is a revenue raiser and will bring in \$4.2 billion to the program.

We have addressed the fact that there have been some problems with NFIP. I think there was some mismanagement, and there was a need for reform. That is why we have spent so much time on this bill to talk to all of the different groups, to talk to all of the Members who have had concerns.

I have got here a list. According to a broad coalition of industry experts and trade associations who all support this, more than 5.6 million policyholders depend on the NFIP as their only source of protection against economic devastation from a flood. In fact, I could read all of those who asked for a "no" vote on this amendment. We have the American Insurance Association, American Land Title Association, Building Owners and Management Association, CCIM Institute, Chamber SWLA, Council of Insurer Agents and Brokers, The Financial Services Roundtable, Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, Institute of Real Estate Management, International Council of Shopping Centers, Manufactured Housing Institute, Mortgage Bankers Association, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Association of REALTORS, National Association of Ready Mix Concrete Association, Society of Industrial and Office Realtors, Property and Casualty Insurance Association of America, The Risk and Insurance Management Society, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

You know, if 5.6 million property owners can't rely on this, what is going to happen? What is going to happen is we wouldn't have flood insurance. And on May 13, the Financial Services Committee favorably reported the Flood Insurance Reform Act by a unanimous vote of 54-0. Anybody who doesn't think that is something on how much time we put into this and how much people care about it, 54-0 in this Con-

gress, I don't think that has happened for a bill that is this important for a long, long time. It really reflects the hard work and the bipartisan support of the Financial Services Committee.

Again, it has a series of reforms that are going to make this a much better program. It improves the financial stability of the NFIP. It reduces the burden on taxpayers. It restores integrity to the FEMA mapping system and explores ways to increase private market participation. It helps to bring certainty to the housing market. I would oppose this amendment strongly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment to terminate the National Flood Insurance Program. The National Flood Insurance Program is, both in its design and execution, the worst Federal program I have encountered in my time in Congress.

This program levies a mandatory flood tax on homeowners who are at virtually no risk of flooding and see absolutely no benefit from the program. In western New York, the requirement to purchase flood insurance has increased mortgage costs and created economic dead zones in once-vibrant neighborhoods.

This amendment will finally end this unfair burden on homeowners in communities like Buffalo and Lackawanna, New York, who neither want nor need to purchase flood insurance. I urge my colleagues to support it as well. I thank the gentlelady from Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would simply reiterate that I don't think this is something that the Federal Government should be involved in. If you are truly a friend of the taxpayers, and believe me, I appreciate the bipartisanship and the hard work about reforming this program. I understand the need to reform programs, but I also understand the need to get a handle on the Federal debt and deficit; and one way to do that is to eliminate unnecessary programs, not just nibble around the edges, which is what I think we are doing here today.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

If this bill were not to pass and if this amendment were to be agreed to, it would be devastating to at least 20,000 communities if there was no flood insurance. Congress would inevitably have to bail out flood disaster victims, as it did prior to 1968; and it would cost so much more money. And the President would have to sign on to any devastation that might be made, as is what happened in Louisiana after Katrina. I oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-138 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. CARDOZA of California.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia.

Amendment No. 20 by Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment No. 25 by Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 230, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—195

Ackerman	Capuano	Cuellar
Andrews	Cardoza	Cummings
Baca	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Davis (IL)
Barletta	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bartlett	Chaffetz	DeGette
Bass (CA)	Chandler	DeLauro
Becerra	Chu	Dicks
Berkley	Cicilline	Dingell
Berman	Clarke (MI)	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Donnelly (IN)
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doyle
Bono Mack	Cleaver	Edwards
Boswell	Clyburn	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Engel
Braley (IA)	Connolly (VA)	Eshoo
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Farr
Burgess	Costa	Fattah
Butterfield	Costello	Filner
Camp	Courtney	Fitzpatrick
Campbell	Critz	Frank (MA)
Capps	Crowley	Fudge

Garamendi Mack
Gibson Maloney
Gonzalez Markey
Green, Al Matsui
Green, Gene McCollum
Grijalva McDermott
Gutierrez McGovern
Hanabusa McIntyre
Harris McNerney
Hastings (FL) Meeks
Heinrich Michaud
Higgins Miller (MI)
Hinojosa Miller (NC)
Hirono Miller, George
Hochul Moore
Holden Moran
Holt Nadler
Honda Napolitano
Insolee Neal
Israel Olver
Jackson (IL) Pallone
Jackson Lee Pascrell
(TX) Pastor (AZ)
Johnson (GA) Paul
Johnson, E. B. Payne
Jones Peters
Kaptur Petri
Keating Pingree (ME)
Kildee Polis
Kind Posey
Kingston Price (NC)
Kissell Quigley
Kucinich Rahall
Langevin Rangel
Larsen (WA) Renacci
Larson (CT) Reyes
Lee (CA) Richardson
Levin Richmond
Lewis (GA) Rigell
Lipinski Ros-Lehtinen
Lofgren, Zoe Rothman (NJ)
Lowey Roybal-Allard
Luján Ruppertsberger
Lynch Rush

NOES—230

Adams Dreier
Aderholt Duffy
Akin Duncan (SC)
Alexander Duncan (TN)
Altmire Ellmers
Amash Emerson
Austria Farenthold
Bachmann Fincher
Bachus Flake
Barrow Fleischmann
Barton (TX) Fleming
Bass (NH) Flores
Benishek Forbes
Berg Fortenberry
Biggert Foss
Billbray Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT) Gallegly
Black Gardner
Blackburn Garrett
Blumenauer Gerlach
Bonner Gibbs
Boren Gingrey (GA)
Boustany Gohmert
Brady (TX) Goodlatte
Brooks Gosar
Broun (GA) Gowdy
Buchanan Granger
Buchson Graves (GA)
Buerkle Graves (MO)
Burton (IN) Griffin (AR)
Calvert Griffith (VA)
Canseco Grimm
Capito Guinta
Carney Guthrie
Carter Hall
Cassidy Hanna
Chabot Harper
Coble Hartzler
Coffman (CO) Hastings (WA)
Cole Hayworth
Conaway Heck
Cooper Hensarling
Cravaack Heger
Crawford Herrera Beutler
Crenshaw Himes
Culberson Huelskamp
Davis (KY) Huizenga (MI)
Denham Hultgren
Dent Hunter
DesJarlais Hurt
Diaz-Balart Issa
Dold Jenkins

Ryan (OH) Olson
Sánchez, Linda Owens
T. Palazzo
Sanchez, Loretta Paulsen
Sarbanes Pearce
Schakowsky Pence
Schiff Perlmutter
Schrader Peterson
Schwartz Pitts
Scott (VA) Platts
Scott, David Poe (TX)
Serrano Pompeo
Sewell Price (GA)
Sherman Quayle
Shuler Reed
Sires Rehberg
Slaughter Reichert
Smith (WA) Ribble
Speier Rivera
Stark Roby
Sutton Roe (TN)
Thompson (CA) Rogers (AL)
Thompson (MS) Rogers (KY)
Paul Rogers (MI)
Tonko Rohrabacher

NOT VOTING—6
Cantor Giffords
Deutch Hinchey

□ 1731

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, RIBBLE, BLUMENAUER, GARY G. MILLER of California, HALL, and AKIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. POSEY, UPTON, SHERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. BONO MACK, Messrs. BARTLETT, WALDEN, BURGESS, HOLDEN, KINGSTON, and HARRIS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 118, noes 305, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—118

Adams Conaway
Akin Culberson
Amash DesJarlais
Bachmann Duncan (SC)
Benishek Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT) Eshoo
Blackburn Flake
Blumenauer Fleischmann
Bono Mack Flores
Brady (TX) Fortenberry
Brooks Foss
Broun (GA) Franks (AZ)
Buerkle Gallegly
Burgess Garamendi
Burton (IN) Gardner
Camp Garrett
Campbell Gingrey (GA)
Chabot Goodlatte
Chaffetz Gowdy
Coffman (CO) Granger

Labrador Nunnelee
Lamborn Olson
Lankford Paul
Latta Paulsen
Lummis Pence
Mack Pitts
Marchant Poe (TX)
Marino Pompeo
McCauley Posey
McClintock Quayle
McDermott Quigley
West Reed
Westmoreland Ribble
Whitfield Rodgers
Wilson (SC) Miller (FL)
Wittman Miller (MI)
Wolf Mulvaney
Womack Murphy (PA)
Woodall Neugebauer
Yoder Nugent

NOES—305

Ackerman Denham
Aderholt Dent
Alexander Diaz-Balart
Altmire Dicks
Andrews Dingell
Austria Doggett
Baca Dold
Bachus Donnelly (IN)
Baldwin Doyle
Barletta Dreier
Barrow Duffy
Bartlett Edwards
Barton (TX) Ellison
Bass (CA) Ellmers
Bass (NH) Emerson
Becerra Engel
Berg Farenthold
Berkley Farr
Berman Fattah
Biggert Filner
Billbray Fincher
Bilirakis Fitzpatrick
Bishop (GA) Fleming
Bishop (NY) Forbes
Black Frank (MA)
Bonner Frelinghuysen
Boren Fudge
Boswell Gerlach
Boustany Gibbs
Brady (PA) Gibson
Braley (IA) Gonzalez
Brown (FL) Gosar
Buchanan Graves (MO)
Buchson Green, Al
Butterfield Green, Gene
Calvert Griffin (AR)
Canseco Grijalva
Capito Grimm
Capps Guinta
Capuano Guthrie
Cardoza Gutierrez
Carnahan Hall
Carney Hanabusa
Carson (IN) Hanna
Carter Harper
Cassidy Hartzler
Castor (FL) Hastings (FL)
Chandler Heinrich
Chu Higgins
Cicilline Himes
Clarke (MI) Hinojosa
Clarke (NY) Hirono
Clay Hochul
Cleave Holden
Clyburn Holt
Coble Honda
Cohen Huizenga (MI)
Cole Insolee
Connolly (VA) Israel
Conyers Jackson (IL)
Cooper Jackson Lee
Costa (TX)
Costello Johnson (GA)
Courtney Johnson (OH)
Cravaack Johnson, E. B.
Crawford Jones
Crenshaw Kaptur
Critz Keating
Crowley Kelly
Cuellar Kildee
Cummings Kind
Davis (CA) King (IA)
Davis (IL) King (NY)
Davis (KY) Kinzinger (IL)
DeFazio Kissell
DeGette Kucinich
DeLauro Lance

Ryan (WI) Landry
Schmidt Langevin
Schweikert Diaz-Balart
Scott (SC) Larson (CT)
Sensenbrenner Latham
Stark LaTourette
Stutzman Lee (CA)
Sullivan Levin
Thornberry Lewis (CA)
Tipton Lewis (GA)
Upton Lipinski
Van Hollen LoBiondo
Walsh (IL) Loebsack
Webster Lofgren, Zoe
Westmoreland Lowey
Wilson (SC) Lucas
Woodall Luetkemeyer
Young (IN) Luján
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell

Rivera	Scott, David	Tonko	Dent	Langevin	Richmond	Markey	Price (NC)	Shuster
Roby	Serrano	Towns	Dicks	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)	McCarthy (NY)	Quayle	Simpson
Rogers (AL)	Sessions	Tsongas	Dingell	Latham	Rohrabacher	McCaul	Quigley	Sires
Rogers (KY)	Sewell	Turner	Doggett	LaTourette	Rooney	McClintock	Reed	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Sherman	Velázquez	Donnelly (IN)	Lee (CA)	Ross (AR)	McCollum	Renacci	Smith (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Visclosky	Doyle	Levin	Rothman (NJ)	McKinley	Rigell	Stearns
Ross (AR)	Shuler	Walden	Duncan (SC)	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Michaud	Rivera	Stivers
Rothman (NJ)	Shuster	Walz (MN)	Duncan (TN)	Lewis (GA)	Ruppersberger	Miller (NC)	Roby	Sullivan
Roybal-Allard	Simpson	Wasserman	Edwards	Lipinski	Rush	Mulvaney	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Runyan	Sires	LoBiondo	Ellison	LoBiondo	Ryan (OH)	Murphy (CT)	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Long	Emerson	Long	Sánchez, Linda	Murphy (PA)	Rogers (MI)	Tipton
Rush	Smith (NE)	Lowe	Engel	Lowe	T.	Myrick	Rokita	Tonko
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Luetkemeyer	Farr	Luetkemeyer	Sánchez, Loretta	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (TX)	Luján	Fattah	Luján	Olson	Noem	Roskam	Walberg
T.	Smith (WA)	Lungren, Daniel	Filner	Lungren, Daniel	Palazzo	Ross (FL)	Ross (FL)	Walden
Sanchez, Loretta	Southerland	E.	Fincher	E.	Schakowsky	Royce	Royce	Walsh (IL)
Sarbanes	Speier	Lynch	Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Schiff	Pence	Runyan	Watt
Scalise	Stearns	Maloney	Fleming	Maloney	Schock	Perlmutter	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Schakowsky	Stivers	Matheson	Fortenberry	Matheson	Schrader	Petri	Schilling	Wilson (SC)
Schiff	Sutton	Matsui	Frank (MA)	Matsui	Schwartz	Pingree (ME)	Schmidt	Wittman
Schilling	Terry	McCarthy (CA)	Frank (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (VA)	Pitts	Schweikert	Wolf
Schock	Thompson (CA)	McCotter	Fudge	McCotter	Scott (TX)	Poe (TX)	Scott (SC)	Woodall
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	McDermott	Gardner	McDermott	Polis	Scott, Austin	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Schwartz	Thompson (PA)	McGovern	Yoder	McGovern	Posey	Shimkus		
Scott (VA)	Tiberi	McHenry	Young (AK)	Gohmert				
Scott, Austin	Tierney	McIntyre	Young (FL)	Gonzalez				

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor	Gohmert	McHenry
Deutch	Hinchey	Pelosi
Giffords	Hoyer	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1736

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CARDOZA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 163, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—261

Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Chu
Adams	Bono Mack	Cicilline
Aderholt	Boren	Clarke (MI)
Akin	Boswell	Clarke (NY)
Alexander	Boustany	Clay
Altmire	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Amash	Brady (TX)	Clyburn
Andrews	Braley (IA)	Cohen
Austria	Broun (GA)	Connolly (VA)
Baca	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Bachmann	Buerkle	Costa
Baldwin	Burgess	Costello
Barrow	Calvert	Courtney
Bartlett	Camp	Crawford
Bass (CA)	Campbell	Critz
Bass (NH)	Capps	Crowley
Becerra	Capuano	Cuellar
Benishkek	Cardoza	Cummings
Berg	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Davis (IL)
Berman	Cassidy	DeFazio
Bilbray	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Denham

Graves (MO)	Green, Al	Green, Gene	Griffin (AR)	Griffith (VA)	Grijalva	Guthrie	Gutierrez	Hanabusa	Harris	Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Heck	Heinrich	Herger	Herrera Beutler	Higgins	Hinojosa	Hochul	Holden	Honda	Inslee	Israel	Issa	Jackson (IL)	Jackson Lee (TX)	Jenkins	Johnson (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Jordan	Kaptur	Keating	Kelly	Kildee	King (IA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Kissell	Kucinich	Landry
DesJarlais	Diaz-Balart	Dold	Dreier	Duffy	Ellmers	Eshoo	Farenthold	Flake	Fleischmann	Flores	Forbes	Fox	Frelinghuysen	Gallegly	Garamendi	Garrett	Gibbs	Gibson	Gingrey (GA)	Goodlatte	Gosar	Gowdy	Granger	Graves (GA)	Grimm	Guinta	Hall	Hanna	Harper	Hartzler								
Hayworth	Hensarling	Himes	Hirono	Holt	Huelskamp	Huizenga (MI)	Hultgren	Hunter	Hurt	Johnson (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Jones	Kind	King (NY)	Kingston	Kline	Labrador	Lamborn	Lance	Lankford	Larsen (WA)	Latta	Loeb	Loeb	Lofgren, Zoe	Lucas	Lummis	Mack	Manzullo	Marchant	Marino							

NOES—163

Bachus	DesJarlais	Hayworth
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Dold	Himes
Biggart	Dreier	Hirono
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holt
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Black	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Hultgren
Blumenauer	Flake	Hunter
Bonner	Fleischmann	Hurt
Brooks	Flores	Johnson (IL)
Buchanan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fox	Jones
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Butterfield	Gallegly	King (NY)
Canseco	Garamendi	Kingston
Capito	Garrett	Kline
Carney	Gibbs	Labrador
Carter	Gibson	Lamborn
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)	Lance
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Lankford
Coble	Gosar	Larsen (WA)
Coffman (CO)	Gowdy	Latta
Cole	Granger	Loeb
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Cooper	Grimm	Lucas
Cravaack	Guinta	Lummis
Crenshaw	Hall	Mack
Culberson	Hanna	Manzullo
Davis (KY)	Harper	Marchant
DeGette	Hartzler	Marino

NOT VOTING—7

Cantor	Hinchey	Pelosi
Deutch	Hoyer	
Giffords	Johnson (GA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1740

Mr. MULVANEY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina and WESTMORELAND changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR.

WESTMORELAND

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

AYES—241

Adams	Boren	Coble
Aderholt	Boustany	Coffman (CO)
Akin	Brady (TX)	Cole
Alexander	Brooks	Conaway
Altmire	Buchanan	Costa
Austria	Bucshon	Cravaack
Bachmann	Buerkle	Crawford
Bachus	Burgess	Crenshaw
Barletta	Burton (IN)	Cuellar
Bartlett	Calvert	Culberson
Barton (TX)	Camp	Davis (KY)
Bass (NH)	Campbell	Denham
Berg	Canseco	Dent
Biggart	Capito	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Cardoza	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Dold
Black	Cassidy	Dreier
Blackburn	Chabot	Duffy
Bonner	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Bono Mack	Chandler	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers Lamborn
 Farenthold Lance
 Fincher Landry
 Fitzpatrick Lankford
 Flake Latham
 Fleischmann LaTourette
 Fleming Latta
 Flores Lewis (CA)
 Forbes LoBiondo
 Fortenberry Long
 Foxx Lucas
 Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen Lummis
 Gardner Lungren, Daniel
 Garrett E.
 Gerlach Manzullo
 Gibbs Marchant
 Gibson Marino
 Gingrey (GA) Matheson
 Gohmert McCarthy (CA)
 Goodlatte McCaul
 Gosar McCotter
 Gowdy McHenry
 Granger McKeon
 Graves (GA) McKinley
 Graves (MO) McMorris
 Griffin (AR) Rodgers
 Griffith (VA) Meehan
 Grimm Mica
 Guinta Miller (FL)
 Guthrie Miller (MI)
 Hall Miller, Gary
 Hanna Mulvaney
 Harper Murphy (PA)
 Harris Myrick
 Hartzler Neugebauer
 Hastings (WA) Noem
 Hayworth Nugent
 Heck Nunes
 Hensarling Nunnelee
 Herger Olson
 Herrera Beutler Owens
 Hochul Palazzo
 Huelskamp Paul
 Huizenga (MI) Paulsen
 Hultgren Pearce
 Hunter Pence
 Hurt Petri
 Issa Pitts
 Jenkins Platts
 Johnson (IL) Poe (TX)
 Johnson (OH) Pompeo
 Johnson, Sam Posey
 Jordan Price (GA)
 Kelly Quayle
 King (IA) Reed
 King (NY) Rehberg
 Kingston Reichert
 Kinzinger (IL) Renacci
 Kline Ribble
 Labrador Richmond

NOES—183

Ackerman Conyers
 Amash Cooper
 Andrews Costello
 Baca Courtney
 Baldwin Critz
 Barrow Crowley
 Bass (CA) Cummings
 Becerra Davis (CA)
 Benishek Davis (IL)
 Berkley DeFazio
 Berman DeGette
 Bilbray DeLauro
 Bishop (GA) Dicks
 Bishop (NY) Dingell
 Blumenauer Doggett
 Boswell Donnelly (IN)
 Brady (PA) Doyle
 Braley (IA) Edwards
 Brown (GA) Ellison
 Brown (FL) Emerson
 Butterfield Engel
 Capps Eshoo
 Capuano Farr
 Carnahan Fattah
 Carney Filner
 Carson (IN) Frank (MA)
 Castor (FL) Fudge
 Chu Gallegly
 Cicilline Garamendi
 Clarke (MI) Gonzalez
 Clarke (NY) Green, Al
 Clay Green, Gene
 Cleaver Grijalva
 Clyburn Gutierrez
 Cohen Hanabusa
 Connolly (VA) Hastings (FL)

Markey Pingree (ME)
 Matsui Polis
 McCarthy (NY) Price (NC)
 McClintock Quigley
 McCollum Rahall
 McDermott Rangel
 McGovern Reyes
 McIntyre Richardson
 McNeerney Rothman (NJ)
 Meeks Roybal-Allard
 Michaud Ruppertsberger
 Miller (NC) Rush
 Miller, George Ryan (OH)
 Moore Sanchez, Linda
 Moran T.
 Murphy (CT) Sanchez, Loretta
 Nadler Sarbanes
 Napolitano Schakowsky
 Neal Schiff
 Oliver Schwartz
 Pallone Scott (VA)
 Pascrell Scott, David
 Pastor (AZ) Serrano
 Perlmutter Sewell
 Peters Sherman
 Peterson Shuler

NOT VOTING—7

Cantor Hinchey
 Deutch Hoyer
 Giffords Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1744

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 238, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

AYES—186

Adams Camp
 Aderholt Campbell
 Akin Canseco
 Altmire Carter
 Amash Cassidy
 Bachmann Chabot
 Bachus Chaffetz
 Barton (TX) Coble
 Bass (NH) Coffman (CO)
 Benishek Cole
 Bilirakis Conaway
 Bishop (UT) Cravaack
 Black Crawford
 Blackburn Culberson
 Bonner Dent
 Bono Mack DesJarlais
 Boustany Duffy
 Brady (TX) Duncan (SC)
 Brooks Duncan (TN)
 Brown (GA) Ellmers
 Buchanan Emerson
 Burgess Farenthold
 Burton (IN) Flake
 Calvert Fleischmann

Hall Marino
 Hanna Matheson
 Harper McCarthy (CA)
 Hartzler McCaul
 Hastings (WA) McCollum
 Hayworth McCotter
 Heck McHenry
 Heinrich McKeon
 Herger McMorris
 Herrera Beutler Rodgers
 Higgins Meehan
 Hochul Mica
 Huelskamp Miller (FL)
 Huizenga (MI) Miller (MI)
 Hultgren Miller, Gary
 Hunter Mulvaney
 Hurt Myrick
 Issa Neugebauer
 Jenkins Nugent
 Johnson, Sam Nunes
 Jones Nunnelee
 Jordan Olson
 Kelly Paul
 King (IA) Paulsen
 Kingston Pearce
 Kline Pence
 Labrador Petri
 Lamborn Pitts
 Lance Platts
 Latta Poe (TX)
 Lewis (CA) Pompeo
 Long Posey
 Lucas Price (GA)
 Lummis Quayle
 Lungren, Daniel Reichert
 E. Ribble
 Mack Roby
 Manzullo Roe (TN)
 Marchant Rogers (KY)

NOES—238

Ackerman DeFazio
 Alexander DeGette
 Andrews DeLauro
 Austria Denham
 Baca Diaz-Balart
 Baldwin Dicks
 Barletta Dingell
 Barrow Doggett
 Bartlett Dold
 Bass (CA) Donnelly (IN)
 Becerra Doyle
 Berg Dreier
 Berkley Edwards
 Berman Engel
 Biggert Eshoo
 Bilbray Farr
 Bishop (GA) Fattah
 Bishop (NY) Filner
 Blumenauer Fincher
 Boren Fitzpatrick
 Boswell Forbes
 Brady (PA) Frank (MA)
 Braley (IA) Fudge
 Brown (FL) Garamendi
 Bucshon Gonzalez
 Buerkle Green, Al
 Butterfield Green, Gene
 Capito Grijalva
 Capps Guthrie
 Capuano Gutierrez
 Cardoza Hanabusa
 Carnahan Harris
 Carney Hastings (FL)
 Carson (IN) Hensarling
 Castor (FL) Himes
 Chandler Hinojosa
 Chu Hirono
 Cicilline Holden
 Clarke (MI) Holt
 Clarke (NY) Honda
 Clay Inslee
 Cleaver Israel
 Clyburn Jackson (IL)
 Cohen Jackson Lee
 Connolly (VA) (TX)
 Conyers Johnson (GA)
 Cooper Johnson (IL)
 Costa Johnson (OH)
 Costello Johnson, E. B.
 Courtney Kaptur
 Cortright Keating
 Critz Kildee
 Crowley Kind
 Cuellar King (NY)
 Cummings Kinzinger (IL)
 Davis (CA) Kissell
 Davis (IL) Kucinich
 Davis (KY) Landry

Rogers (MI) Langevin
 Rohrabacher Lankford
 Rokita Larsen (WA)
 Rooney Larson (CT)
 Ross (FL) Latham
 Royce LaTourette
 Ryan (WI) Lee (CA)
 Scalise Levin
 Schilling Lewis (GA)
 Schmidt Lipinski
 Schmitt LoBiondo
 Schweikert Loeb sack
 Scott, Austin Lofgren, Zoe
 Sensenbrenner Lowey
 Sessions Luetkemeyer
 Smith (NE) Lujan
 Southerland Lynch
 Stearns Maloney
 Stivers Markey
 Stutzman Matsui
 Sullivan Wittman
 Terry Wolf
 Thompson (PA) Womack
 Thornberry Woodall
 Tiberi Yoder
 Tipton Young (AK)
 Turner Young (IN)
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Reyes	Scott (SC)	Tonko	Holt	Michaud	Schiff	Ribble	Schweikert	Thompson (PA)
Richardson	Scott (VA)	Towns	Honda	Miller (MI)	Schrader	Rivera	Scott (SC)	Thornberry
Richmond	Scott, David	Tsongas	Inlee	Miller (NC)	Schwartz	Roby	Scott, Austin	Tiberi
Rigell	Serrano	Van Hollen	Israel	Miller, George	Scott (VA)	Roe (TN)	Sensenbrenner	Tipton
Rivera	Sewell	Velázquez	Jackson (IL)	Moore	Scott, David	Rogers (AL)	Sessions	Turner
Rogers (AL)	Sherman	Visclosky	Jackson Lee	Moran	Serrano	Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Walberg
Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Walz (MN)	(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Sewell	Rohrabacher	Shuler	Walden
Roskam	Shuler	Wasserman	Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Sherman	Rokita	Shuster	Walsh (IL)
Ross (AR)	Shuster	Schultz	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Simpson	Rooney	Smith (NE)	West
Rothman (NJ)	Simpson	Waters	Jones	Neal	Sires	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Watt	Kaptur	Olver	Slaughter	Roskam	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Runyan	Slaughter	Waxman	Keating	Owens	Stark	Ross (AR)	Smith (WA)	Wilson (SC)
Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Welch	Kildee	Pallone	Sutton	Ross (FL)	Southerland	Womack
Rush	Smith (TX)	West	Kind	Pascrell	Terry	Royce	Speier	Woodall
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)	Kissell	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)	Runyan	Stearns	Yoder
Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Wittman	Kucinich	Peters	Tierney	Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Young (AK)
T.	Stark	Wittman	Peterson	Pingree (ME)	Tonko	Schilling	Stutzman	Young (IN)
Sanchez, Loretta	Stivers	Wolf	Langevin	Platts	Towns	Schmidt	Sullivan	
Sarbanes	Sullivan	Woolsey	Larsen (WA)	Polis	Tsongas	Schock	Thompson (MS)	
Schakowsky	Sutton	Wu	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Upton			
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth	Latham	Rahall	Van Hollen			
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Young (FL)	Lee (CA)	Rangel	Velázquez			
Schwartz	Tierney		Levin	Reyes	Visclosky			
			Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Walz (MN)			
			Lipinski	Richmond	Wasserman			
			Loeb sack	Rigell	Schultz			
			Loefgren, Zoe	Watt	Waters			
			Lowey	Waxman	Watt			
			Lujan	Webster	Waxman			
			Lynch	Rush	Webster			
			Maloney	Welch	Welch			
			Markey	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)			
			Matsui	Sánchez, Linda	Wittman			
			McCarthy (NY)	T.	Wolf			
			McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey			
			McDermott	Sarbanes	Wu			
			McGovern	Scalise	Yarmuth			
			McNerney	Schakowsky	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—7

Cantor Giffords Pelosi
Deutch Hinchey
Ellison Hoyer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1749

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

AYES—192

Ackerman	Chu	Donnelly (IN)
Andrews	Cicilline	Doyle
Baca	Clarke (MI)	Edwards
Baldwin	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Barrow	Clay	Engel
Barton (TX)	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bass (CA)	Clyburn	Farr
Becerra	Coble	Fattah
Berkley	Cohen	Filner
Berman	Connolly (VA)	Forbes
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Fudge
Boren	Costa	Garamendi
Boswell	Courtney	Gibson
Boustany	Critz	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Grijalva
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Capps	Davis (IL)	Hanabusa
Capuano	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Cardoza	DeGette	Higgins
Carnahan	DeLauro	Hirono
Carney	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Dicks	Hirano
Cassidy	Dingell	Hochul
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Holden

NOES—230

Adams	Farenthold	Lamborn
Aderholt	Fincher	Lance
Akin	Fitzpatrick	Lankford
Alexander	Flake	LaTourette
Altmire	Fleischmann	Latta
Amash	Fleming	Lewis (CA)
Austria	Flores	LoBiondo
Bachmann	Fortenberry	Long
Bachus	Fox	Lucas
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Bass (NH)	Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel
Benishek	Gardner	E.
Berg	Garrett	Mack
Biggart	Gerlach	Manzullo
Bilbray	Gibbs	Marchant
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	Marino
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Matheson
Black	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Blackburn	Gosar	McCaul
Blumenauer	Gowdy	McClintock
Bonner	Granger	McCotter
Bono Mack	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Brooks	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Broun (GA)	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Buchanan	Grimm	McMorris
Bucshon	Guinta	Rodgers
Buerkle	Guthrie	Meehan
Burgess	Hall	Mica
Burton (IN)	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Harper	Miller, Gary
Camp	Harris	Mulvaney
Campbell	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Canseco	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Capito	Hayworth	Neugebauer
Carter	Heck	Noem
Chabot	Heinrich	Nugent
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Nunes
Chandler	Herger	Nunnelee
Coffman (CO)	Herrera Beutler	Olson
Cole	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Paul
Costello	Hultgren	Paulsen
Cravaack	Hunter	Pearce
Crawford	Hurt	Pence
Crenshaw	Issa	Perlmutter
Culberson	Jenkins	Petri
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Pompeo
DesJarlais	Jordan	Posey
Dold	Kelly	Price (GA)
Dreier	King (IA)	Quayle
Duffy	King (NY)	Quigley
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rehberg
Ellmers	Kline	Reichert
Emerson	Labrador	Renacci

NOT VOTING—9

Cantor Hinchey Payne
Deutch Hoyer Pelosi
Giffords Meeks Rogers (KY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1752

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 38, noes 384, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

AYES—38

Amash	Goodlatte	Myrick
Bartlett	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Hensarling	Paul
Benishek	Higgins	Petri
Broun (GA)	Holden	Price (GA)
Brown (FL)	Huelskamp	Quayle
Chaffetz	Labrador	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Royce
Duncan (TN)	Mack	Sensenbrenner
Flake	McClintock	Walsh (IL)
Fox	McHenry	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Woodall
Gallegly	Mulvaney	

NOES—384

Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Adams	Berg	Boustany
Aderholt	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Akin	Berman	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Biggart	Braley (IA)
Altmire	Bilbray	Brooks
Andrews	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Austria	Bishop (GA)	Bucshon
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Buerkle
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Bachus	Black	Burton (IN)
Baldwin	Blackburn	Butterfield
Barletta	Blumenauer	Calvert
Barrow	Bonner	Camp
Bass (CA)	Bono Mack	Campbell
Bass (NH)	Boren	Capito

Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cohen
 Cole
 Conaway
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Denham
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Frank (MA)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gonzalez
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna

Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Heinrich
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holt
 Honda
 HuiZENGA (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Kucinich
 Lance
 Landry
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 LoebSack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Long
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNERNEY
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George

Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Oliver
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Reyes
 Ribble
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stark
 Stearns

Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas

Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster
 Welch

West
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Canseco
 Cantor
 Deutch
 Giffords
 Gohmert
 Hinchey
 Hoyer
 Johnson (GA)
 Pelosi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1756

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 340, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOSWELL. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOSWELL moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1309, to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 57, after line 2, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING RELIEF FOR 2011 FLOOD VICTIMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The flood disasters and emergencies of 2011 have been unprecedented.

(2) Such flood disasters and emergencies cover 696 counties in 29 States.

(3) The President has declared a major disaster from flooding in 2011 for 26 counties in Louisiana, 32 counties in Indiana, 34 counties in Montana, 7 counties in Vermont, 23 counties in New York, 3 counties in Alaska, 21 counties in Illinois, 16 counties in Oklahoma, 6 counties in Idaho, 37 counties in South Dakota, 48 counties in Mississippi, 34 counties in Minnesota, 47 counties in North Dakota, 38 counties in Missouri, 64 counties in Tennessee, 76 counties in Kentucky, 57 counties in Arkansas, 23 counties in Georgia, 67 counties in Alabama, 20 counties in North Carolina, 13 counties in California, 3 counties in Hawaii, 8 counties in Oregon, 7 counties in Washington, 3 counties in Utah, and 3 counties in Maine.

(4) The President has declared an emergency from flooding in 2011 for 28 counties in Missouri, 4 counties in Kansas, 18 counties in Nebraska, 26 counties in Louisiana, 4 counties in Tennessee, 14 counties in Mississippi, and 22 counties in North Dakota.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the sense of the Congress that relief should be provided in the form of grants to families in areas affected by flooding to repair damage to their homes and in the form of assurances that such homeowners are not subjected to additional flood insurance premium increases as they struggle in the aftermath of disaster recovery.

SEC. 15. EMERGENCY AID TO ASSIST 2011 FLOOD VICTIMS.

(a) ASSISTANCE WITH INCREASED COST OF COMPLIANCE.—Subsection (b) of section 1304 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011(b)) is amended—

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

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) properties for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.”.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1326. GRANTS FOR REPAIRING FLOOD DAMAGE TO HOMES IN DISASTER AREAS.

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may make grants under this section to owners of qualified residences for costs of repairing damage to such residences caused by flooding for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act on or after January 1, 2011.

“(b) TERMS.—The Administrator shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to establish appropriate limitations and terms regarding grants under this section, which may include limitations and terms regarding the amount of grants, avoiding duplication of reimbursement for damages, use

of grant amounts, and such other issues as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(C) QUALIFIED RESIDENCE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified residence’ means a residential structure that—

“(1) consists of from 1 to 4 dwelling units;

“(2) is located within the area for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as a result of flooding; and

“(3) is covered, upon issuance of such declaration, by a contract for flood insurance coverage under this title.”

(2) AVAILABILITY OF NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND.—Section 1310(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) for grants under section 1326.”

Page 21, line 22, strike the closing quotation marks and the last period.

Page 21, after line 22, insert the following new paragraph:

“(5) TOLLING OF PERIODS AFTER DISASTERS.—In the case of any covered property that is subject under subsection (i) to a prohibition on increases in chargeable risk premium rates, any 12-month period applicable to such covered property under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall be tolled for the duration of the 36-month period applicable to such covered property under subsection (i), and any increases in risk premium rates otherwise effective upon expiration of any of such 12-month periods shall take effect upon the expiration of such periods as resumed after such tolling.”

Page 27, after line 11, insert the following new subsection:

(e) RELIEF FROM PREMIUM INCREASES TO ASSIST 2011 FLOOD VICTIMS.—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—

(1) in subsection (c), in the matter that precedes paragraph (1), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, by inserting “, and subsection (i)” after “subsection (g)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) RELIEF FROM PREMIUM INCREASES TO ASSIST 2011 FLOOD VICTIMS.—Subject to subsection (h) and notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title, in the case of any area for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act on or after January 1, 2011, as a result of flooding, the chargeable risk premium rates for flood insurance coverage under this title for any structure located within such area upon the issuance of such declaration may not be increased at any time during the 36-month period beginning upon issuance of such declaration.”

Page 27, line 12, strike “(e)” and insert “(f)”.

Page 19, line 22, strike “and” and insert a comma.

Page 20, lines 3 and 4, strike “Notwithstanding” and insert the following: “Subject only to subsections (h) and (i) and notwithstanding”.

Mr. BOSWELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading.

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. DOLD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the outset, let me say this amendment does not—repeat, does not—kill the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been hit by devastating and unprecedented flooding this past spring that has displaced and damaged homes in 29 States and nearly 700 counties. That is right. Nearly three-fifths of the States in this country, 60 percent, have counties that have been declared emergency areas by the President. I would like to insert into the RECORD the list of States and counties that have been hit by the floods of 2011.

In my home State of Iowa, right as we stand here in this Chamber, we are seeing flooding as the Missouri River rises on the western border. Just last week, the Department of Agriculture declared Fremont, Harrison, Mills, Monona, Pottawattamie, and Woodbury Counties in Iowa as agriculture disaster areas. Farmers, homeowners, and small business owners are seeing their lives and their very livelihoods quite literally being washed away. As I talk to mayors, county supervisors, and my friends across the State who are being affected, they want to know if their government, this Congress, will stand with them in their time of dire need. We need to step up to the plate and help these flood victims rebuild their lives and repair the damage, and they should not be subjected to premium increases as they struggle to get back on their feet.

This final amendment helps flood victims in three important ways:

First, this amendment builds on a bipartisan program that was established in 1994 following the devastating Midwestern floods by reimbursing a flood policyholder for the cost of rebuilding a flood-damaged structure as needed to comply with State and local floodplain management laws.

Second, this amendment provides a new important tool to aid victims of the 2011 floods by giving the agency discretion to provide grants to homeowners to repair flood damage.

Third, this amendment provides a temporary reprieve from any increases in flood insurance premiums for policyholders as they struggle to rebuild their homes and their lives. It does so by suspending any increases in flood insurance premiums for a period of 36 months—we’re talking about in-

creases—for policyholders located in areas designated by the President as a major disaster or emergency.

Importantly, this amendment accomplishes this in a responsible way by limiting such assistance to homeowners with existing flood policies. It rewards those who have obtained flood insurance and have paid into the Flood Insurance Fund. This amendment is consistent with the underlying policy of this bill by encouraging homeowners to obtain flood insurance, and by placing the program on stronger financial footing through a responsible phase-in of risk premium rates to full actuarial rates.

In past years, Congress has stepped up to the plate and provided assistance to victims of natural disasters. That is what epitomizes our great country and its spirit. Yet this Congress has shown a disregard for flood victims at a time when we are struggling to recover from the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Yes, we are a country marked by individual initiative, but we are also a country of compassion.

□ 1810

This final amendment is not a hand-out. It provides immediate assistance and relief to those homeowners who have paid into the Flood Insurance Fund. The Flood Insurance Fund is paid through premiums and fees paid by policyholders, not the taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to read the list of 29 States and 696 counties that have been hit by these devastating floods and join me in providing swift and immediate assistance to your constituents. These are your friends, your neighbors; and they are asking for your help. So I ask you to stand with them, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Vote “yes” on this final amendment; and, remember, it does not kill the underlying bill.

STATEMENT OF REP. LEONARD L. BOSWELL TO ACCOMPANY THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE BILL, H.R. 1309 WITH INSTRUCTIONS

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, there have been a total of 696 counties in 29 states for which a Major Disaster or Emergency has been declared. There is some overlap of states for which a major disaster and emergency have been declared and some overlap of counties for which a major disaster and emergency have been declared. Below is a breakdown of the affected counties and states by major disaster and by emergency.

26 STATES FOR WHICH A MAJOR DISASTER HAS BEEN DECLARED IN 2011 FOR FLOODING*

Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington

696 COUNTIES IN 26 STATES COVERED BY A MAJOR DISASTER DECLARATION IN 2011 FOR FLOODING*

Alabama Counties

Autauga County, Baldwin County, Barbour County, Bibb County, Blount County, Bullock County, Butler County, Calhoun County, Chambers County, Cherokee County,

Chilton County, Choctaw County, Clarke County, Clay County, Cleburne County, Coffee County, Colbert County, Conecuh County, Coosa County, Covington County, Crenshaw County, Cullman County, Dale County, Dallas County, DeKalb County, Elmore County, Escambia County, Etowah County, Fayette County, Franklin County, Geneva County, Greene County, Hale County, Henry County, Houston County, Jackson County, Jefferson County, Lamar County, Lauderdale County, Lawrence County, Lee County, Limestone County, Lowndes County, Macon County, Madison County, Marengo County, Marion County, Marshall County, Mobile County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, Morgan County, Perry County, Pickens County, Pike County, Randolph County, Russell County, Saint Clair County, Shelby County, Sumter County, Talladega County, Tallapoosa County, Tuscaloosa County, Walker County, Washington County, Wilcox County, and Winston County.

Alaska Counties

Crooked Creek (ANV/ANVSA), Kuspuk Regional Educational Attendance Area, and Red Devil (ANV/ANVSA).

Arkansas Counties

Arkansas County, Baxter County, Benton County, Boone County, Bradley County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Chicot County, Clark County, Clay County, Cleburne County, Cleveland County, Conway County, Craighead County, Crawford County, Crittenden County, Dallas County, Faulkner County, Franklin County, Fulton County, Garland County, Greene County, Hot Spring County, Howard County, Independence County, Izard County, Jackson County, Johnson County, Lawrence County, Lee County, Lincoln County, Lonoke County, Madison County, Marion County, Mississippi County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, Nevada County, Newton County, Perry County, Phillips County, Pike County, Poinsett County, Polk County, Prairie County, Pulaski County, Randolph County, Saint Francis County, Saline County, Searcy County, Sharp County, Stone County, Van Buren County, Washington County, White County, Woodruff County, and Yell County.

California Counties

Del Norte County, Inyo County, Kern County, Kings County, Monterey County, Orange County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Diego County, San Luis Obispo County, Santa Barbara County, Santa Cruz County, and Tulare County.

Georgia Counties

Bartow County, Catoosa County, Cherokee County, Coweta County, Dade County, Floyd County, Gordon County, Greene County, Harris County, Heard County, Jasper County, Lamar County, Lumpkin County, Meriwether County, Monroe County, Morgan County, Newton County, Pickens County, Rabun County, Spalding County, Troup County, Walker County, and White County.

Hawaii Counties

Hawaii County, Honolulu County, and Maui County.

Idaho Counties and Indian Reservations

Bonner County, Clearwater County, Idaho County, Nez Perce County, Nez Perce Indian Reservation, and Shoshone County.

Illinois Counties

Alexander County, Franklin County, Gallatin County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Jackson County, Jefferson County, Lawrence County, Marion County, Massac County, Perry County, Pope County, Pulaski County, Randolph County, Saline County, Union County, Wabash County, Washington County, Wayne County, White County, and Williamson County.

Indiana Counties

Benton County, Clark County, Crawford County, Daviess County, Dearborn County, Dubois County, Floyd County, Franklin County, Gibson County, Harrison County, Jackson County, Jefferson County, Jennings County, Knox County, Martin County, Monroe County, Ohio County, Orange County, Parke County, Perry County, Pike County, Posey County, Putnam County, Ripley County, Scott County, Spencer County, Starke County, Sullivan County, Switzerland County, Vanderburgh County, Warrick County, and Washington County.

Iowa Counties

Fremont County, Harrison County, Mills County, Monona County, Pottawattamie County, and Woodbury County.

Kentucky Counties

Anderson County, Ballard County, Bath County, Boone County, Boyd County, Bracken County, Breathitt County, Breckinridge County, Butler County, Caldwell County, Calloway County, Campbell County, Carlisle County, Carroll County, Carter County, Christian County, Clay County, Crittenden County, Daviess County, Edmonson County, Elliott County, Estill County, Fleming County, Floyd County, Franklin County, Fulton County, Gallatin County, Grant County, Graves County, Grayson County, Green County, Greenup County, Hancock County, Harlan County, Henderson County, Henry County, Hickman County, Hopkins County, Johnson County, Kenton County, Knott County, Lawrence County, Lee County, Lewis County, Livingston County, Logan County, Lyon County, Magoffin County, Marion County, Marshall County, Martin County, Mason County, McCracken County, McLean County, Meade County, Menifee County, Mercer County, Monroe County, Morgan County, Nelson County, Nicholas County, Oldham County, Owen County, Owsley County, Pendleton County, Perry County, Robertson County, Rowan County, Spencer County, Todd County, Trigg County, Trimble County, Union County, Washington County, Webster County, and Wolfe County.

Maine Counties

Aroostook County, Piscataquis County, and Washington County.

Minnesota Counties

Becker County, Beltrami County, Big Stone County, Blue Earth County, Brown County, Carver County, Chippewa County, Clay County, Grant County, Kittson County, Lac qui Parle County, Le Sueur County, Lyon County, Marshall County, McLeod County, Nicollet County, Norman County, Otter Tail County, Polk County, Ramsey County, Red Lake County, Red Lake Indian Reservation, Redwood County, Renville County, Roseau County, Scott County, Sibley County, Stevens County, Swift County, Traverse County, Washington County, Wilkin County, Wright County, and Yellow Medicine County.

Mississippi Counties

Adams County, Alcorn County, Attala County, Benton County, Bolivar County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Chickasaw County, Choctaw County, Claiborne County, Clarke County, Clay County, Coahoma County, DeSoto County, Greene County, Hinds County, Holmes County, Humphreys County, Issaquena County, Itawamba County, Jasper County, Jefferson County, Kemper County, Lafayette County, Lee County, Marshall County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, Neshoba County, Newton County, Noxubee County, Panola County, Prentiss County, Quitman County, Scott County, Sharkey County, Smith County, Tate County, Tippah County, Tishomingo County,

Tunica County, Union County, Warren County, Washington County, Webster County, Wilkinson County, Winston County, and Yazoo County.

Missouri Counties

Barry County, Bollinger County, Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Carter County, Christian County, Douglas County, Dunklin County, Howell County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, McDonald County, Miller County, Mississippi County, New Madrid County, Newton County, Oregon County, Ozark County, Pemiscot County, Perry County, Pettis County, Polk County, Reynolds County, Ripley County, Saint Francois County, Saint Louis County, Sainte Genevieve County, Scott County, Shannon County, Stoddard County, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County, Washington County, Wayne County, Webster County, and Wright County.

Montana Counties and Indian Reservations

Big Horn County, Blaine County, Broadwater County, Carbon County, Carter County, Cascade County, Chouteau County, Crow Indian Reservation, Custer County, Dawson County, Fallon County, Fergus County, Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Garfield County, Golden Valley County, Hill County, Judith Basin County, McCone County, Meagher County, Musselshell County, Petroleum County, Phillips County, Powder River County, Prairie County, Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation, Roosevelt County, Rosebud County, Stillwater County, Sweet Grass County, Treasure County, Valley County, Wheatland County, Wibaux County, and Yellowstone County.

New York Counties

Allegany County, Broome County, Chemung County, Chenango County, Clinton County, Delaware County, Essex County, Franklin County, Hamilton County, Herkimer County, Lewis County, Livingston County, Madison County, Niagara County, Oneida County, Onondaga County, Ontario County, Steuben County, Tioga County, Ulster County, Warren County, Wyoming County, and Yates County.

North Carolina Counties

Alamance County, Bertie County, Bladen County, Craven County, Cumberland County, Currituck County, Greene County, Halifax County, Harnett County, Hertford County, Hoke County, Johnston County, Lee County, Onslow County, Pitt County, Robeson County, Sampson County, Tyrrell County, Wake County, and Wilson County.

North Dakota Counties and Indian Reservations

Barnes County, Benson County, Billings County, Bottineau County, Burke County, Burleigh County, Cass County, Cavalier County, Dickey County, Divide County, Eddy County, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, Foster County, Grand Forks County, Grant County, Griggs County, Kidder County, LaMoure County, Logan County, McHenry County, McIntosh County, McKenzie County, McLean County, Mercer County, Morton County, Mountrail County, Nelson County, Pembina County, Pierce County, Ramsey County, Ransom County, Renville County, Richland County, Rolette County, Sargent County, Sheridan County, Spirit Lake Reservation, Steele County, Stutsman County, Towner County, Traill County, Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, Walsh County, Ward County, Wells County, and Williams County.

Oklahoma Counties

Adair County, Caddo County, Canadian County, Cherokee County, Delaware County, Grady County, Haskell County, Kingfisher County, Le Flore County, Logan County, McClain County, McIntosh County,

Muskogee County, Okmulgee County, Pittsburg County, and Sequoyah County.

Oregon Counties

Clackamas County, Clatsop County, Coos County, Crook County, Curry County, Douglas County, Lincoln County, and Tillamook County.

South Dakota Counties

Aurora County, Beadle County, Brookings County, Brown County, Buffalo County, Butte County, Charles Mix County, Clark County, Clay County, Codington County, Day County, Deuel County, Edmunds County, Faulk County, Grant County, Hamlin County, Hand County, Hanson County, Hughes County, Hutchinson County, Hyde County, Jackson County, Jerauld County, Kingsbury County, Lake County, Marshall County, Miner County, Moody County, Perkins County, Potter County, Roberts County, Sanborn County, Spink County, Stanley County, Sully County, Union County, and Yankton County.

Tennessee Counties

Benton County, Bledsoe County, Blount County, Bradley County, Campbell County, Carroll County, Chester County, Cocke County, Crockett County, Davidson County, Decatur County, Dickson County, Dyer County, Fayette County, Fentress County, Franklin County, Gibson County, Giles County, Grainger County, Greene County, Hamilton County, Hardeman County, Hardin County, Henderson County, Henry County, Hickman County, Houston County, Humphreys County, Jackson County, Jefferson County, Johnson County, Knox County, Lake County, Lauderdale County, Lawrence County, Lewis County, Lincoln County, Loudon County, Madison County, Marion County, Marshall County, McMinn County, McNairy County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, Moore County, Morgan County, Obion County, Perry County, Pickett County, Polk County, Rhea County, Scott County, Sequatchie County, Shelby County, Smith County, Stewart County, Sullivan County, Sumner County, Tipton County, Union County, Washington County, Wayne County, and Weakley County.

Utah Counties

Garfield County, Kane County, and Washington County.

Vermont Counties

Addison County, Chittenden County, Essex County, Franklin County, Grand Isle County, Lamoille County, and Orleans County.

Washington Counties

King County, Kittitas County, Klickitat County, Lewis County, Skagit County, Skamania County, and Wahkiakum County.

7 STATES FOR WHICH AN EMERGENCY HAS BEEN DECLARED IN 2011 FOR FLOODING*

Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Tennessee

116 COUNTIES IN 7 STATES COVERED BY EMERGENCY DECLARATION IN 2011 FOR FLOODING*

Kansas Counties

Atchison County, Doniphan County, Leavenworth County, and Wyandotte County.

Louisiana Counties

Ascension Parish, Assumption Parish, Avoyelles Parish, Catahoula Parish, Concordia Parish, East Baton Rouge Parish, East Carroll Parish, East Feliciana Parish, Franklin Parish, Iberia Parish, Iberville Parish, La Salle Parish, Lafourche Parish, Madison Parish, Pointe Coupee Parish, Richland Parish, Saint Charles Parish, Saint James Parish, Saint John the Baptist Parish, Saint Landry Parish, Saint Martin Parish, Saint Mary Parish, Tensas Parish, Terrebonne Parish, West Baton Rouge Parish, and West Feliciana Parish.

Mississippi Counties

Adams County, Bolivar County, Claiborne County, Coahoma County, DeSoto County, Humphreys County, Issaquena County, Jefferson County, Sharkey County, Tunica County, Warren County, Washington County, Wilkinson County, and Yazoo County.

Missouri Counties

Andrew County, Atchison County, Boone County, Buchanan County, Callaway County, Carroll County, Chariton County, Clark County, Clay County, Cole County, Cooper County, Franklin County, Gasconade County, Holt County, Howard County, Jackson County, Lafayette County, Lewis County, Moniteau County, Montgomery County, Osage County, Platte County, Ray County, Saint Charles County, Saint Louis, Saint Louis County, Saline County, and Warren County.

Nebraska Counties

Boyd County, Burt County, Cass County, Cedar County, Dakota County, Dixon County, Douglas County, Garden County, Knox County, Lincoln County, Morrill County, Nemaha County, Otoe County, Richardson County, Sarpy County, Scotts Bluff County, Thurston County, and Washington County.

North Dakota Counties

Barnes County, Benson County, Burleigh County, Cass County, Eddy County, Emmons County, Grand Forks County, McLean County, Mercer County, Morton County, Nelson County, Oliver County, Pembina County, Ramsey County, Ransom County, Richland County, Sioux County, Standing Rock Indian Reservation (also SD), Towner County, Traill County, Walsh County, and Ward County.

Tennessee Counties

Dyer County, Lake County, Shelby County, and Stewart County.

*Data is based on information publicly available on the Federal Agency Management Association (FEMA) website at: <http://www.fema.gov/news/disasters.fema>.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to recommit, and I must say that I'm very disappointed in my friends on the other side of the aisle for offering up yet another politically motivated motion, especially considering that the flood insurance bill passed out of the Financial Services Committee 54-0; 54-0 out of the Financial Services Committee.

On top of that, we spent the majority of today debating the bill before the House and entertaining some 25 motions and amendments to the bill. The motion to recommit cynically undermines the broad bipartisan cooperation I have been pleased to see throughout this legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the type of political bickering that the American people have loudly rejected. This circumvents the flood insurance program. It is actually a disservice to the people who you are attempting to try to help. The point of flood insurance is to prevent assistance packages like this and should be taken up in regular order. We have no idea of the cost of the new grants, the new programs, and

the new spending in this disaster relief package.

It prohibits us from charging actuarial rates. What the flood insurance bill tries to do is infuse more private sector solutions, put in a new map, and provide actuarial rates which will help benefit the American public. Over 5 million residents and commercial properties rely on flood insurance today; 20,000 American communities rely on it. We must make sure that this flood insurance bill goes through, not circumvent the process with some disaster relief package.

This is an attempt to have an insurance program without paying the premiums. Frankly, we can't afford to do that. I would urge my colleagues, especially those on the Financial Services Committee who again passed it out of committee 54-0, to vote "no" on this motion to recommit.

I want to thank the chairmen, Chairman BIGGERT and the chairman of the full committee, Chairman BACHUS, and also the ranking member, Mr. FRANK, and the ranking member in the subcommittee, Ms. WATERS, for their leadership. What we don't need now is to have the other side try to circumvent this process with a disaster relief bill.

I urge my colleagues on this side and that side to support the underlying bill and reject the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2417.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—181

Ackerman	Carney	Davis (CA)
Altmire	Carson (IN)	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Baca	Chandler	DeLauro
Baldwin	Chu	Dicks
Barrow	Cicilline	Dingell
Bass (CA)	Clarke (MI)	Doggett
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Donnelly (IN)
Berkley	Clay	Doyle
Berman	Cleaver	Edwards
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Ellison
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Engel
Boren	Connolly (VA)	Eshoo
Boswell	Conyers	Farr
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Fattah
Braley (IA)	Costello	Filner
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Butterfield	Critz	Fudge
Capps	Crowley	Garamendi
Carnahan	Cummings	Gonzalez

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch

Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Schiff
Petri
Ryan (WI)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers

Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes

Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
LoBisack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Pallazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns

Deutch
Giffords
Himes
Hinchev
Rush
Stearns

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

Deutch
Giffords
Himes
Hinchev
Rush
Stearns

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1831

Mr. COSTA changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 561 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 22, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

AYES—406

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Caputo
Capuano
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)

DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkeley
Berman
Biggart

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brady (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)

Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Caputo
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes

Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
LoBisack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Pallazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns

Stivers	Turner	West	Dreier	Kline	Renacci	Luján	Pingree (ME)	Shuler
Stutzman	Upton	Westmoreland	Duffy	Labrador	Ribble	Lynch	Polis	Sires
Sullivan	Van Hollen	Whitfield	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rivera	Maloney	Price (NC)	Slaughter
Sutton	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)	Duncan (TN)	Lance	Roby	Markey	Quigley	Smith (WA)
Terry	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)	Ellmers	Landry	Roe (TN)	Matsui	Rangel	Speier
Thompson (CA)	Walberg	Wittman	Emerson	Lankford	Rogers (AL)	McCarthy (NY)	Reed	Stark
Thompson (MS)	Walden	Wolf	Farenthold	Latham	Rogers (KY)	McCollum	Reichert	Sutton
Thompson (PA)	Walz (MN)	Womack	Fincher	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)	McDermott	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Thornberry	Wasserman	Woodall	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rohrabacher	McGovern	Richardson	Thompson (MS)
Tiberi	Schultz	Woolsey	Flake	Lewis (CA)	Rokita	McIntyre	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
Tierney	Waters	Wu	Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Rooney	McNerney	Rigell	Tierney
Tipton	Watt	Yarmuth	Fleming	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Meeks	Ross (AR)	Tonko
Tonko	Waxman	Young (AK)	Flores	Lucas	Roskam	Michaud	Rothman (NJ)	Towns
Towns	Webster	Young (FL)	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Ross (FL)	Miller (NC)	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Tsongas	Welch	Young (IN)	Fortenberry	Lummis	Royce	Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen

NOES—22

Amash	Graves (GA)	Petri	Frelinghuysen	Mack	Rodgers	Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky
Benishek	Higgins	Quayle	Gallegly	Manullo	Smith (NJ)	Nadler	T. Sánchez	Walz (MN)
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher	Marchant	Marino	Smith (TX)	Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Chaffetz	Labrador	Sensenbrenner	Schmidt	Matheson	Southerland	Neal	Sarbanes	Schultz
Duncan (TN)	Mack	Walsh (IL)	Schock	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns	Olver	Schakowsky	Waters
Flake	McClintock	Yoder	Schweikert	McCaul	Stivers	Owens	Schiff	Watt
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)		Scott (SC)	McClintock	Stutzman	Pallone	Schrader	Waxman
Gallegly	Paul		Scott, Austin	McCotter	Sullivan	Pascrell	Schwartz	Welch
			Sensenbrenner	Gosar	Terry	Pastor (AZ)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
			Sessions	McHenry	Thornberry	Payne	Scott, David	Woolsey
			Shimkus	McKeon	Tipton	Pelosi	Serrano	Wu
			Shuster	McKinley	Turner	Perlmutter	Sewell	Yarmuth
			Simpson	McMorris	Upton	Peters	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—3

Deutch	Giffords	Hinchey
--------	----------	---------

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1839

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETTER USE OF LIGHT BULBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2417) to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency, and for other purposes, 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 gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 193, answered “present” 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

YEAS—233

Adams	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Aderholt	Boren	Chabot
Akin	Boustany	Chaffetz
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Coble
Amash	Brooks	Coffman (CO)
Austria	Broun (GA)	Cole
Bachmann	Buchanan	Conaway
Bachus	Bucshon	Costello
Barletta	Buerkle	Cravaack
Bartlett	Burgess	Crawford
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Benishek	Calvert	Culberson
Berg	Camp	Davis (KY)
Biggert	Campbell	Denham
Bilirakis	Canseco	Dent
Black	Cantor	DesJarlais
Blackburn	Capito	Diaz-Balart
Bonner	Carter	Dold

Ackerman	Conyers	Hanna
Altmire	Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Andrews	Costa	Heinrich
Baca	Courtney	Higgins
Baldwin	Critz	Himes
Barrow	Crowley	Hinojosa
Bass (CA)	Cuellar	Hirono
Bass (NH)	Cummings	Hochul
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Holden
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Holt
Berman	DeFazio	Honda
Bilbray	DeGette	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Huelskamp
Blumenauer	Dicks	Inslee
Boswell	Dingell	Israel
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA)	Donnelly (IN)	Jackson Lee
Brown (FL)	Doyle	(TX)
Butterfield	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Engel	Kaptur
Cardoza	Eshoo	Keating
Carnahan	Farr	Kildee
Carney	Fattah	Kind
Carson (IN)	Finler	Kissell
Castor (FL)	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Chandler	Fudge	Langevin
Chu	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Cicilline	Garrett	Larson (CT)
Clarke (MI)	Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Levin
Clay	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)
Cleaver	Griffith (VA)	Lipinski
Clyburn	Grijalva	Loeb
Cohen	Gutierrez	Loeback
Connolly (VA)	Hanabusa	Lofgren, Zoe
		Lowey

NAYS—193

Conyers	Hanna
Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Costa	Heinrich
Courtney	Higgins
Critz	Himes
Crowley	Hinojosa
Cuellar	Hirono
Cummings	Hochul
Davis (CA)	Holden
Davis (IL)	Holt
DeFazio	Honda
DeGette	Hoyer
DeLauro	Huelskamp
Dicks	Inslee
Dingell	Israel
Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Donnelly (IN)	Jackson Lee
Doyle	(TX)
Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Engel	Kaptur
Eshoo	Keating
Farr	Kildee
Fattah	Kind
Finler	Kissell
Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Fudge	Langevin
Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Garrett	Larson (CT)
Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Green, Al	Levin
Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)
Griffith (VA)	Lipinski
Grijalva	Loeb
Gutierrez	Loeback
Hanabusa	Lofgren, Zoe
	Lowey

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Bishop (UT)

NOT VOTING—4

Bishop (GA)	Giffords
Deutch	Hinchey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1845

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2018, CLEAN WATER COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM ACT OF 2011

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-144) on the resolution (H. Res. 347) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2018) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to preserve the authority of each State to make determinations relating to the State's water quality standards, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was on official business on last Friday, July 8, with the privilege of seeing the last shuttle launch in Florida, the Atlantis, a very important issue for my congressional district and, I might say, a mighty, magnificent expression of American genius.

Because of that, I missed the following roll call votes on Thursday, July 7, which I would like to submit into the RECORD. I will read them very briefly. For roll call vote No. 521—and these were under the Defense appropriations bill—I would have voted “yes.” For roll call vote 522, I would have voted “no.” Roll call vote 523, I

would have voted "yes." For roll call vote 524, "Reaffirming the United States commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and for other purposes," I would have voted "aye."

For Friday, July 8, when I, as well, missed votes for that reason, official business, for roll call vote No. 525, I would have voted "no." For roll call vote 526, I would have voted "no." Roll call vote 527, I would have voted "no." Roll call vote 528, which interferes with the chaplain's duties in the United States military, I would have voted a resounding "no." For roll call vote 529, I would have voted "no." Roll call vote 530, I would have voted "no." And for roll call vote 533, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the Chair regarding my absence from rollcall votes 515–524 on Thursday, July 7, 2011.

I was not able to cast my votes during rollcall 515–524 because I was on official business. I would like to state for the RECORD how I would have voted had I been present.

For rollcall vote 521, on agreeing to an Amendment to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative WELCH of Vermont, "An amendment to limit the use of funds to not more than \$200,000,000, provided by title IX under the heading 'Operation and Maintenance, Army,' may be available for the Commander's Emergency Response Program. Also, the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced by \$200,000,000," I would have voted yes.

For rollcall vote 522, on agreeing to Amendment No. 4 to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative COLE of Oklahoma, "An amendment numbered 4 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to prohibit the use of funds be used to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of the this Act," I would have voted nay.

For rollcall vote 523, on agreeing to Amendment No. 97 to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative FRANK, "An Amendment to add a section at the end of the bill which reduces the total amount of appropriations by \$8,500,000,000 not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available by title I ("Military Personnel"), under the heading "Defense Health Program" in title VI, or by title IX ("Overseas Contingency Operations")," I would have voted aye.

For rollcall vote 524, on motion to suspend the rules and agree as amended in H. Res. 268, "Reaffirming the United States commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and for other purposes," I would have voted aye.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the Chair regarding my absence from rollcall votes 525–533 on Friday, July 8, 2011.

I was not able to cast my votes during rollcall 525–533 because I was on official business. I would like to state for the RECORD how I would have voted had I been present.

For rollcall vote 525, on agreeing to Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative FLAKE of Arizona, "An amendment to reduce funds made available by this Act for

'Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide' by \$250,000,000," I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote 526, on agreeing to Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative FLAKE of Arizona, "An amendment to reduce the amounts made available in sundry sections of title IV," I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote 527, on agreeing to Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative FLAKE of Arizona, "An amendment to reduce the amounts made available in sundry sections of title IV," I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote 528, on agreeing to Amendment No. 77 to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative HUELSKAMP of Kansas, "An amendment numbered 77 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to prohibit the use of funds to implement the curriculum of the Chaplain Corps Tier 1 DATD repeal training dated April 11, 2011" I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote 529, on agreeing to an Amendment to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative POLIS of Colorado, "An amendment to prohibit use of funds in the bill to maintain an end strength level of troops in Europe to more than 30,000 and to reduce military personnel accounts accordingly" I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote 530, on agreeing to an Amendment to H.R. 2219 offered by Representative KUCINICH of Ohio, "An amendment to prohibit the use of funds for military operations in or against Libya except under a declaration of war against Libya pursuant to clause 11 in section 8 of article I of the Constitution" I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote 533, on agreeing to a resolution H. Res. 340 to "Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program" I would have voted "yea."

TODAY'S AFRICAN AMERICAN PARENTS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of points that I would just like to bring really to the attention of my colleagues and to indicate that I hope we can do better. That's my message: I hope we can do better.

I hope we can do better than having two Presidential candidates in the Republican Party sign a pledge that would suggest that children of slaves were much better off than the children of African American parents today. We know that we have a high number of single parents throughout the United States raising children. But just read the slave narratives and the biography of Frederick Douglass to know that there were no marriages among slaves—it was not allowed—and that children were torn away from their parents. And husbands or wives or those who had given birth or created children were torn away from each other. Slavery was a destructive part of this country, and never compare it with the life that we have today.

I would also suggest that if we are negotiating the debt ceiling, we should not have leaders in the room that make the statement that we'll have no resolution because President Barack Obama is President. I'm insulted, offended, and it is not becoming as adults.

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

□ 1850

HOUSE ENERGY ACTION TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the last Congress was known as the Congress of bailouts, takeovers, taxation, and regulation. This Congress is working to be the Congress of free markets, achieving American energy independence, and job creation.

Back in May, the House passed three sweeping pieces of energy legislation designed to help end our country's dependence on Middle Eastern oil and help create American jobs by allowing deep sea energy exploration and production.

Tonight we are going to talk about American energy independence and how energy is a segue into job creation, how we can put Americans back to work. As a proud member of the House Committee on Natural Resources, we passed three I think very, very strong bills that would put America back to work, especially in the Gulf of Mexico. We passed H.R. 1229. This is the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act. It would end the Obama administration's de facto moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico in a safe, responsible, transparent manner by setting firm timelines for considering permits to drill, which will provide certainty and allow employers and workers to get back on the job.

I don't know how many Members of Congress have been out in the Gulf of Mexico like me and looked at offshore drilling and offshore energy production. There is a difference between drilling and production. Drilling is finding the oil, drilling that well. Then they move a production platform in there to start producing that. And I talk with my colleagues from Louisiana and Mississippi and Texas that understand that the Gulf States are hurting because it's not the Big Oil companies that are out of work. It's the folks that work on those rigs out in the gulf, doing the day-to-day labor of tapping that American energy resource.

But it's also the folks back on the beach that are providing the service industry, the ones that go out and provide the food and the transportation to the workers going back and forth. It's the ships that pull the anchors when the drilling platform wants to move somewhere else. It's the pipefitters and

welders back on shore that are providing the necessary service to that industry. We want to put the gulf back to work. We urge the Senate to pass H.R. 1229 that we sent over in May. And let's put the Gulf of Mexico back to work. In a few minutes I'm going to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, who is going to talk more about that.

Then we passed the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, which would require the Obama administration to move forward and promptly conduct offshore lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico. I served on the Outer Continental Shelf 5-year Planning Subcommittee that looked at oil and natural gas leases on the Outer Continental Shelf all around the United States. And I know what a convoluted, long process it is to have a lease sale.

The administration is failing America by not having lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico, or off the coast of Alaska, or really anywhere else on the Outer Continental Shelf. It's time to restart that leasing program so that we can tap the American resources that we have in this country. H.R. 1230 is another bill we passed out on May 5. The Senate needs to act on that one, Mr. Speaker. We passed it with a bipartisan vote of 266-149.

The third bill that came out, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act, H.R. 1231, another one the Senate has failed to act on. This would lift the President's ban on new offshore drilling by requiring the administration to move forward on the 2012 to 2017 lease plan with energy production in the areas containing the most oil and natural gas resources.

We know where those resources are. They are off the coast of Mississippi and Alabama and Texas and the western Gulf of Mexico. They are also off the coast of South Carolina and Virginia on the Outer Continental Shelf. They are in the Alaskan Sea and off the coast of Alaska, where recently we saw the EPA deny Shell Oil Company an air quality permit.

Now, Americans need to listen. This isn't an oil drilling permit. They were ready to go. They had their drilling permit. But the EPA denied them an air quality permit. And a drilling platform does flare off the gas that sometimes seeps through when they are drilling for oil, and they flare that gas off to keep from having a dangerous explosion like we saw in Deepwater Horizon. Flare gas, natural gas that's flared off.

They are denied an air quality permit because 70 miles away on the coast, 70 miles away is an indigenous village of 250 people. So this administration's going to keep us from harvesting our natural resources in Alaska by not denying a drilling permit, but by denying an air quality permit to a drilling platform in the Alaskan Sea because it might impact a small village in Alaska. That's the kind of administration policies that we're dealing with and we're fighting here in this Congress.

Folks, we want to put America back to work. Energy is a segue to job creation. Think about it. The refining capacity that needs to be expanded as we expand the harvesting of oil and natural gas. New refineries in this country. It's been over 30 years, I believe, since we've had a new refinery permit in this country. We often think about energy, we think about fossil fuels, hydrocarbons, oil and natural gas. But when I talk about energy, I think about expanded nuclear power and how one nuclear power plant can put 5,000 people to work, 10,000 people to work in my area with new construction jobs. And then once the construction phase is over with, we've got long-term, good paying jobs like we have at the Oconee nuclear power plant in Seneca, South Carolina.

I believe in nuclear power as a stable, reliable source of energy in this country. We've got to expand nuclear power. We've got to look at modularization and miniaturization. At any given time, folks, we've got over 100 small nuclear reactors floating around the seas of the world in the United States Navy. And you know what? We haven't had a single mishap. Small, modularized nuclear reactors that work. Thinking outside the box, do we do that for small communities, neighborhoods, or small cities with smaller nuclear reactors like we have on aircraft carriers and submarines?

Recent studies from the American Petroleum Institute showed the United States is poised to create thousands of new jobs next year only if the Federal Government stops blocking the permitting process. There is a study that says that in Alaska alone—this was conducted by the University of Alaska—over 54,000 jobs could be created and sustained with deep sea production in Alaska.

I am going to yield in a little while to the gentleman from North Dakota, who will tell you that North Dakota's got one of the lowest, if not the lowest, unemployment rate in the United States, 3.2 percent. It's because of the energy jobs that are being created in the Bakken oil field in North Dakota. He is going to tell you more about that because it is a wonderful success story on how energy-related jobs expand the economy and put Americans back to work.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington State, who knows that putting Americans back to work can happen if we harvest the natural resources that we've got in this great country.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you for that. I couldn't agree more. You know what we're talking about here is jobs, job creation. And the best way to do that is to explore for energy here, to develop our energy resources. And that's why I am pleased to be a part of this Congress.

When I hear from folks back home, they say, "Jamie, we sent you to D.C. for solutions." And that's precisely

what this Congress has been about. With the gentleman you are going to hear from and others, I helped launch the House Energy Action Team, or HEAT is what we like to call it. It's an initiative with my House colleagues that we've started to bring forward energy solutions that put forward jobs for Americans. And I am a solutions-oriented person.

Solutions are definitely what America needs right now. And I see this from the vantage point of my corner of this country in southwest Washington State. Here is a good example. Just a few weeks ago, I met with John Leber. He is the owner of Swanson Bark in Longview. And basically, his business moves material for the forest products industry, including biomass for energy producers.

Now, the first problem we have encountered, and he has seen here with regard to some of these regulations, is we have very strict boiler MACT rules that are on hold. But if they are implemented, they would cost the forest products industry alone \$5 billion to \$7 billion to implement. And that's not hiring new people, that's not expanding their business, that's just costs of complying with Federal Government rules.

□ 1900

And there is more. The second problem is thousands of manufacturing and industrial facilities across this country use incinerators that would be affected, meaning they are going to have to spend more money, not to hire more people or to grow their business, but to comply with Federal Government rules.

Now, instead of stepping on the air hose of employers like John Leber, I cosponsored legislation and a solution that would allow the EPA to make the Boiler MACT rule more reasonable. Makes common sense; right? In turn, this would help the promising industry of biomass and the jobs that would come with it.

Now, the gentleman from South Carolina very rightly pointed out the energy exploration solutions that we passed here off this House floor. This is just one solution that I think is going to help, and I want to add it to those four. We are working on that. HEAT members here tonight are joining together to call on the Senate.

We have passed at least four bills that provide American energy solutions that will promote American energy jobs. The Senate needs to step up. I am going to share for you and reiterate some of those bills that we passed because they are very important. This is important to America's energy security and America's energy independence.

The first one is the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011. This would have simply required the EPA to speed up its approvals for energy exploration in Alaska. That's it. Speed up your approvals. That's pretty simple.

Developing and safely exploring for energy here would have produced a million barrels of oil per day, and it would

create more than 54,000 American energy jobs. Now, not all of us like the gentleman from North Dakota have such low unemployment rates. I think it was quoted as about 3 percent. I would be doing backflips for 3 percent unemployment.

In southwest Washington, we have had double-digit unemployment now for 3 years, 3-plus years, and it's horrible. So we need to get these things moving here in America and create those jobs, especially when it's within our reach to do.

And one of the other solutions that we worked on as a team was reversing President Obama's offshore moratorium. This would contribute over 1.2 million new jobs for Americans who are hurting across this country; 800 million in revenue would have come in if the Senate would move this bill.

Now, as we are talking about the deficit and deficit reductions and the debt ceiling—and I agree with what one of the Senators said. We don't need new taxes; we need new taxpayers. So getting more people to work, paying taxes is going to help us get out of the debt that this country is facing, and it's going to create more jobs.

The third bill that we worked on and passed off of this House, one of the solutions that we have already pushed through this Chamber, is the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act, and that bill simply reinforces safety measures through permitting inspections while increasing American energy.

I hope you are sensing a theme here tonight: American energy solutions and American jobs.

And the fourth one that we were pleased to get off this floor a few months ago was the Restarting the American Offshore Leasing Now Act. Now, this moves us forward with lease sales that were cancelled or postponed by this administration.

Remember, I mentioned stepping on that air hose. Well, a lot of the rules that have come out this administration have stepped on the air hose for employers in our Nation, and it has got to stop. We need to increase America's energy supply. This would increase thousands of American jobs, and it's common sense. All of these commonsense solutions that increase American energy production make it cheaper for families to fill their car with gas, to heat their homes, and it would give relief to American employers.

I am merely asking, and my colleagues here tonight, we are merely asking the Senate to imagine a future in the United States where energy is abundant and affordable and where we aren't riding the roller coaster of high gas prices that. Basically, those prices are set by other nations that don't like us very much.

So I encourage our Senate colleagues to join us in passing and pursuing more solutions like these that the people of this country deserve.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I was out in Washington State with the

gentlewoman from Washington several years ago, looking at nuclear power, looking at the Hanford site, talking about reprocessing of nuclear, spent nuclear fuel rods and how reprocessing can deal with some of the waste by-product but can also provide an energy source for our nuclear power reactors, and I know you are interested in that as well. So thank you for your comments.

I next want to introduce and yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who understands that these are resources that we are talking about here in America. All the natural gas resources don't belong to President Obama; they belong to the American people. And it's time that the American people speak loudly that we want to put Americans back to work, providing American solutions for American energy issues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank my colleague.

We are sitting here today with unemployment over 9 percent and rising, 22 million Americans out of work, and what are we getting? We are getting an administration whose bureaucrats have got a stranglehold on America's energy future.

I stood in this Chamber just a couple of months ago when the Prime Minister of Australia addressed a joint session of the House. I know my colleagues will remember that. And the Prime Minister said something that was profound. She related a story. She talked about being a young girl sitting in front of her television and watching Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin land on the moon and thinking to herself, Wow, those Americans can do anything.

She went on to give her speech, and she talked about the long relationship between Australia and America and how we have solved many of the world's problems. At the end of her speech, she said, You know something? She said, I am not that young girl any more. I am the Prime Minister of our country, but today I still believe that Americans can do anything.

That was profound, and I think for many of us it was like you could hear a pin drop here in the House Chamber because what she said was something that we need to hear from our national leaders, and we are not getting that kind of leadership here in America today.

I believe that Americans can do anything. We saw, when President Kennedy decided that we were going to the Moon in 10 years, he mobilized our academic institutions. He engaged our industrial base, our military, our political will, our economic will. Every fabric of our culture was focused on that goal.

I remember as a young boy watching the space race shots from school or being sent home because it was like a national holiday. We had a national vision. We saw industries crop up. We saw hundreds of thousands of jobs created. We saw young people going into

disciplines that would prepare them for careers in aerospace and astronautics and other disciplines to support our conquest of the space frontier.

I am so proud to be a part House Energy Action Team because we are trying to promote that same type of national vision around energy independence and security.

I believe if we had a national vision that said, look, over the next 10 years we are drawing a line in the sand starting today, and we are going to establish a goal to be energy secure and energy independent over the next 10 years. And we are going to drill for our own oil; we are going to drill for our own natural gas. We are going to continue to mine coal, and we are going to learn how to use it environmentally soundly and safely. We are going to expand our nuclear footprint. We are going to look at our alternative forms of energy like wind and solar and find out where they fit into our overall energy profile. But what we are not going to do is sit on the sidelines any longer and depend on foreign sources for our energy and put future generations at risk. I believe if we had that kind of vision, we would again see industries crop up. We would see hundreds of thousands of jobs created as a result. And at the end of the day, we would learn how to produce and store and use energy in ways that we have never, ever imagined, because guess what? Americans can do anything. With a national vision around energy independence and security, Americans would be put back to work.

□ 1910

I live in a district and represent a district where unemployment rates are popping up well over 10 percent. Some of them 12-plus percent. Ladies and gentlemen, people from my district have lost hope in the American Dream. We need a national vision around energy. That's what this House is promoting. That's what my colleagues and I are striving for. I, too, urge the Senate, take action on these bills. Get America back to work, and let's secure America's energy future.

Thank you for letting me have some time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I, too, believe in America's greatness. And I stood here and heard her talk about the world is looking to America to be great again. This is an area that we can be great in. I've traveled around my district recently and asked folks about rising gas prices and the impact that they were having on the family budget, how they were having to reach deeper into their wallet and not take out the \$20 bill, but take out the \$100 bill to fill up their tank for their family for their normal commute, grocery shopping and other things they do. Americans are hurting.

The gentleman from Ohio is on the Natural Resources Committee. And when we passed those bills out to this floor and passed those bills out from

this floor to the Senate, you saw an immediate reaction by the administration, saying that we need to harvest American resources and increase domestic energy. The action of this Congress, we saw a reduction in fuel prices the next week, I think a 15-cent per gallon reduction, in my district. That's the kind of impact, that's the kind of signals we can send to the market by doing the right thing for the American people and focusing on domestic production and putting Americans back to work.

The gentleman from Louisiana came from the oil and natural gas industry. He and I have had numerous conversations about the impact that the moratorium and the de facto moratorium has had on the economies in the Gulf States. And it's not only the loss of jobs and the income taxes that are associated with that, but it's the loss of revenue to the States from the royalties that they get from the oil and natural gas production.

But in this country, at a time when we are hurting economically from loss of jobs and the lessening of income revenue to this country, keep in mind that I believe second only to—well, actually third only—to income tax revenue and corporate income tax and other revenue and borrowing. The revenue this country receives from oil and natural gas royalties is third only to those two things.

So I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, because he has got a unique story to tell.

Mr. LANDRY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I thank him for speaking today on what I believe is one of the most important areas in this country for getting our economy back on track. And I want to share with him and the rest of you an email I received today.

Today I received an email that said, JEFF, my wife has finally convinced me to send you an email and update you on where I am in Louisiana. It says, I still have not returned to work, but it is looking like I may go to work in early August. And I'm going to be headed out to a particular block out in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico to do a P&A job, a plug and abandonment job.

So this isn't looking for additional oil and gas or producing more oil and gas. It's a plug and abandonment job.

He says, I'm not sure when we will actually get back to drilling or completing wells. This moratorium is beginning to impact me. I am fortunate that my company has kept me on since I'm a consultant, not an employee. But my income is down significantly, and my concerns about the future of the Gulf of Mexico has me looking elsewhere. I recently turned down an opportunity in Malaysia but may not turn it down again. At a time when our country is hurting, it is unbelievable that our leaders are putting more of us out of work, yet still giving money to other countries. The government

spends. Spending and total unconcern for the working people of this country is wearing on us. It is also annoying to see that one of the first cuts in government spending is in education, but numerous other entitlement programs continue to keep money going towards them.

He is fed up. And the sad part, the sad part about this is that this is an American worker. And our government is basically saying, to him, a guy who has a trade, who is plying his trade, that you can no longer ply that trade in this country. If you want to continue to earn a living for your family, you need to go to another country. You need to go to Brazil or Malaysia or to Egypt and follow the rigs out of the Gulf of Mexico, out of this country, in order to keep your job.

Think about that. We are basically telling Americans right now that we don't like the job that you've been doing. Regardless of how dangerous it was and regardless of how many weeks away from your family offshore you spent, Christmases, Easters, that doesn't count. Your job isn't good enough for this country anymore. You need to go somewhere else to ply your trade.

That is just absurd when we have an opportunity in this country to do all the things that fix the economy. We can reduce the deficit, just like the gentleman from South Carolina said, we could, by increasing drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and domestically, we could send an additional \$1.7 billion, \$1.7 billion, to the Treasury to reduce our deficit simply by increasing our drilling activity. We could increase employment. We all know we need it. The jobs numbers came out last week, 9.2 percent unemployment. We are not creating jobs. We can create jobs by drilling domestically.

And I'm not talking minimum wage jobs. There is not a person in the Gulf of Mexico on a drilling platform who makes minimum wage. Those jobs pay good money. So we can do that. We can reduce our deficit, and we can reduce unemployment.

Do you know what else we can do? We can lower the price of energy for Americans out there. Drilling domestically does all three. It creates jobs, reduces the deficit, and decreases energy costs to Americans all over the country. It lowers the price at the pump. The President has already acknowledged that supply affects the market when he went out there and released millions of barrels—30 million barrels—out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. It's the wrong reserve, Mr. President. The proper reserve is in the Gulf of Mexico, in Alaska and elsewhere in this country.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for giving me this time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. What would happen if we had a hurricane? We're in hurricane season, and we've released 30 billion gallons from the reserve. Wasn't that there for that purpose?

Mr. LANDRY. That is why, the last time prior to this when we did release oil from the strategic reserve was exactly that instance, when Hurricane Katrina affected the refineries and the production platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. And you're right. We should not be using that reserve unless it is an emergency.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I tell you what, you've hit on something that I think we need to talk more about in this Congress, and that is the administration taking the easy road, trying to lessen fuel prices at the pump for Americans. But it was a short-term, short-lived impact, if it had any impact at all.

I appreciate your comments on the administration having a "drill there and not here" policy, encouraging exploration and drilling off the coast of Brazil when we've got the resources right here in this country. The Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of my State or off the coast of Virginia, where they have an energy policy that wants to tap those resources. In the Alaskan Sea off the coast, where we know there is proven oil and natural gas resources. An expansion in deep-water in the Gulf of Mexico. So I appreciate your comments.

The gentleman from North Dakota knows all too well what energy production means for jobs. The Bakken oil formation in North Dakota, Montana, and up into Canada even, has tremendous resources that can be harvested. There's an estimated 12 billion barrels of oil in North Dakota alone in the Bakken formation.

□ 1920

I hope he will talk about the impact that jobs created in North Dakota have on that unemployment rate.

I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we know the tremendous potential of energy production here in America. Recent studies show just how much energy we have available. In fact, by 2020, in the West we could produce as much oil and gas as the U.S. is currently importing from Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, Venezuela, Colombia, Algeria, Nigeria, and Russia combined. The West alone has the potential to produce more than 1.3 million barrels of oil every single day. That's more than our current imports from Russia, Iraq, and Kuwait combined. If we're serious about creating American jobs, serious about lowering energy prices, and breaking our dependence on foreign oil, we must invest in energy resources and reserves within our borders.

In North Dakota, we know the potential of oil and natural gas. The last U.S. Geological Survey estimated that the Bakken field held nearly 4 million barrels of recoverable oil; but the new estimates, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, suggest that the

Bakken formation offers at least 12 billion barrels of recoverable oil.

We produce more than 355,000 barrels of oil each day. We are home to the largest deposit of lignite coal in the world. Our State holds tremendous wind potential as well, and we've attracted thousands of jobs to North Dakota. It is projected by 2020 that jobs in the oil industry will increase by over 16,000. That is a direct result of developing these energy resources in North Dakota. That's a 35 percent increase over 2010 levels.

North Dakota's unemployment is less than 3.5 percent. It's 3.2 percent. In western North Dakota, where Bakken development is taking place, we can't find enough people to work. In that county, unemployment is below 1 percent. Starting wages for people are over \$80,000. We need people to help increase this supply of oil.

I just think every day when I'm out here and coming back from North Dakota, imagine what we could do if our whole country had the same approach as we do in North Dakota, the jobs that we could create across this country and the security that we could protect within our country by reducing our dependence on foreign oil. We could reduce our 9.2 percent unemployment rate if we move forward with energy development. We have to get rid of the burdensome regulations which are preventing businesses from creating American jobs.

This is not the time to restrict energy production and prevent jobs from being created. Yet that is exactly what the President's policies have done. In fact, I've kind of joked, if you want to see exactly what not to do to increase the supply and lower the price and reduce the cost of energy for individuals and businesses, small businesses across America, look at what's happening out here in our Nation's Capital.

The President's official moratorium on drilling cost 12,000 jobs. Declining energy production in the Gulf of Mexico is costing the U.S. over \$4.7 million a day in lost revenue. Overreaching government regulations continue to hinder energy production in the United States. With thousands of Americans still out of work and prices at the pump remaining high, now is not the time to slow down our energy growth. Now is the time to invest in our own energy resources. We need a long-term, commonsense energy plan like EmPower in North Dakota. We need a plan that will lower energy costs, that will create jobs and break our dependence on foreign oil. We did it in North Dakota. We can do it across America.

We can create good-paying American jobs, we can lower energy prices, and we can break our dependence on foreign oil. It's time to work together to end the overregulation, to encourage energy development, and to work to strengthen America's energy potential.

Thank you.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

The time is now. The time is now to stop the policies of this administration of taking Federal land off the table when it comes to wind, solar, and hydrogen.

The wind farms. There's a bill in our committee that deals with NOAA's obstacles to wind farms off the coast. To the Federal land in the West that's off the table for solar, land that's owned by you, the taxpayer, that is not available for new solar panels and solar technology and wind farms and expansion of the power grid and power cables and transmission lines.

The folks in Oklahoma have known energy production for a long time. I was talking with a gentleman from Oklahoma earlier about a new technology to lessen our dependence on Middle Eastern oil by using the gray matter that God gave us to create new technologies.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to share some exciting news with us coming out of his great State.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you.

I am honored to get a chance to talk about a great American resource, and that is our energy. Let me take you back a little bit. I'm 43 years old. I can remember in elementary school I was allowed to be able to work with the debate team in high school. It was my honor to be the littlest guy in the middle of this high school debate team. In the 1970s, the debate topic that year was "Resolved, America Should Pursue Alternative Energy Options."

Since the 1970s, we've been talking about hydroelectric and solar and wind. We've been trying to advance this technology, and I hope we will continue to crack the code on that to make those energy solutions work well for us. Since the 1970s, we've been talking about trying to get off fossil fuels and—guess what—it is still the dominant resource that we are using in our country, and it is still the most effective resource to be able to move our vehicles, to be able to heat our homes and to be able to produce these petrochemicals that are used in almost everything that we lay our hands on nowadays.

I hope one day I can run my car off a pinwheel that's on the top of it, but currently I run my car on gasoline. I hope I can heat my home one day with a solar panel on the roof, but currently the technology is not there to be able to do that. My home is heated with natural gas. There's electricity in all the different dynamics that come in. I look at it and I say, at 43 years old, I've been hearing my whole life that we need a national energy policy—drilling, pipelines, production, retailing—to be able to work out a plan that we can run as a country that is all of the above that is every bit of our energy, but that is not ignoring the energy that we have here.

I can tell you I am sick to death of hearing how we need to shut down fossil fuel production in the United States because of environmental reasons,

knowing full well that we will just import more of those fossil fuels from all around the world. The United States produces the cleanest energy on the planet. If we want to have clean energy, whether that be fossil fuels or alternative fuels, we should be doing whatever it takes to make sure we drill here, that we produce here, and that we are the ones that are using the energy in the cleanest method possible. No one does it cleaner than us. I can assure you we don't go to Saudi Arabia and find out they produce energy cleaner there.

So if you're truly concerned about planetary issues with the environment, you would make sure all the production that's needed in the United States is produced in the United States to make sure that we continue to protect that.

Let me take you to my beautiful State. Come walk into Oklahoma sometime. Since 1949 in Oklahoma, we've been fracking for oil. What many people are calling some new technology of fracking, and everyone seems to be afraid of it, and say, Is it going to hurt the groundwater and is it going to hurt all these things, I smile and I say, Come to my beautiful State. Since 1949, we've been fracking. Over 100,000 times we have fracked in Oklahoma; 100,000 times plus. Come drink our water, come breathe our air, and come see our absolutely beautiful God-given State. We can do this in an environmentally friendly way.

We have in my district 5.7 percent unemployment because we have a lot of great energy companies that are doing a terrific job of both protecting our environment and providing jobs for the people in our area. We can do this. And to flippantly say, these are dirty oil companies and they're big oil companies, and we've got to do whatever it takes to punish Big Oil is flippant.

I was in a hearing not long ago with Timothy Geithner. He was discussing punishing Big Oil and getting more taxes on that. I was able to say to him, Mr. Secretary, are you aware that the majority of energy companies in the United States are independent producers and they're small companies? Ninety-five percent of the drilling and the oil and gas production that happens in the United States is done by independent producers, these 18,000 small companies that are out there.

□ 1930

These 18,000 small companies that are out there, they account for 67 percent of the total energy production in the United States. These small companies, on average, have 12 people on staff, 12 employees. These are not big, giant companies. And throwing around terms like "Big Oil" and attacking them makes me smile when I think about what is happening in Oklahoma with lots and lots of service companies and producers and drillers that are really doing great jobs.

I was talking to one of those companies recently. Guess who they are targeting to be able to hire? Their favorite people to be able to hire are returning vets because of their work ethic and because of the skills they are bringing back. They are companies specifically going after returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans to be able to hire them.

It was interesting. We were talking about drilling. You go into a drilling platform, and they say their favorite people to be able to hire are actually tank drivers returning from the war zone because they are used to driving equipment and looking at a screen and dealing with multiple things all at once. These are folks who are employing our veterans and providing great jobs.

Recently, I was on a fracking site, being given a chance to watch it. When you go into a frack site, I don't know what your image is of what it looks like to actually see a well being fracked, but it is high-tech jobs, people on computers, as well as people and pumping. It is trucks and people providing food and people providing all the equipment. It is both people with big wrenches and people with small computers. And you see this multitude of jobs that are provided by oil and gas and by fossil fuels that we are producing right here in America.

We are at a moment that we can either say: We want all green jobs. We want to destroy the jobs that are in producing fossil fuels and try to create new jobs in green jobs; or we can say: Let's do both. Let's encourage the growth of green jobs, but let's not, in the process, also discourage one of the most productive industries that we have in the United States, and that is providing our own energy.

I would love for folks to come to Oklahoma and to be able to see the great companies that are doing some very innovative things.

If I may mention one more thing, just today, one of our companies, Chesapeake, announced a new initiative that is taking natural gas and injecting it into a heat-up service and using biomass and injecting air at a high temperature, and out comes gasoline that runs in our cars. They are not asking for any kind of Federal grant. They are doing it on their own and producing brand new clean energy that will run the current vehicles we have now. At the same time, they are, in the next 10 years, dropping \$1 billion to upgrade an infrastructure for natural gas on the highway system so big trucks can run on natural gas and will have a place to be able to fill up.

Industries are doing this. They want to see this. This is a way that great American companies can produce great American energy. They are patriots, and I hope we will continue to encourage these folks.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. The same American greatness that the gentleman from Ohio was talking about, where innovation meets a need.

We have a need for energy independence, and innovation is meeting that need by creating a brand new company and technology to put gasoline in America's cars and trucks and tractors. And what an amazing story coming out of Oklahoma. Hydraulic fracturing is something that I think is next on the table for this Congress to address because we are seeing a lot of misinformation out there about hydraulic fracturing contaminating drinking water. Folks, that is just wrong. There hasn't been a single instance where a hydraulic fracturing operation has contaminated drinking water.

From my understanding, most of the natural gas shales, such as Marcellus or the ones out in Oklahoma and Texas, are 10,000 feet to 6,000 feet deep in the earth. And most wells where we get our drinking water are 300 feet to 1,000 feet. A thousand feet would be a deep well, a very expensive well for Americans. That's why they don't go that far. They look somewhere else for water.

The fracking takes place much deeper, so there hasn't been a single instance. The misinformation out there has been refuted by you many times in Oklahoma when you say, I repeat, Come drink our water in Oklahoma. I appreciate that.

A key Republican energy proposal is the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska Access Act that will cut through bureaucratic red tape and unlock the full potential of energy resources in the Alaskan Natural Petroleum Reserve by ensuring that oil and natural gas are developed and transported in a timely and efficient manner. But there are delays in accessing that from this administration. And whether these delays are the result of government incompetence or ideological vendettas, the fact of the matter is that these regulations are costing American jobs and raising energy prices.

The House has offered a clear path on job creation and economic recovery. That path is less taxation, less regulation, less government intervention, and more economic certainty in the marketplace.

The folks from Kansas have talked to me numerous times about energy, and so I would like to take an opportunity to yield to Mr. HUELSKAMP from Kansas to talk about what is going on out there and that great American State's focus on American energy independence.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. I am very interested in learning what continues to happen every day in our other States, particularly our State to the south.

Being from the State of Kansas, I would like to talk a little bit about the coal industry. You might say, Kansas and the coal industry, what does that have to do with Kansas?

I am a farmer by trade, and we produce a lot of corn and wheat and

soybeans and many other things. But in order to produce those, we need a lot of electricity. A number of decades ago we built a coal-fired electrical power plant in western Kansas. It generates electricity that covers six to seven States. About 5 or 6 or 7 years ago, we said we need more electricity. Our economy continues to grow, and we need more electricity. We began the process in western Kansas to expand our electrical production. We need more electricity.

If the economy is going to grow—and I'm sorry to say, now the economy is not growing very quickly under this administration, and let me tell you why. It is called overregulation. It is called litigation. It is called the attempt by this administration and others outside that are working together with this administration to stop the generation of more electricity, more energy of various types. We need more energy. We need more American energy, and we can produce that. We are trying to do that right now in western Kansas. We are trying to produce more jobs.

This administration and folks close to this administration—and this is hard to believe—they have said that you want 1,900 construction jobs. You want to create 1,900 jobs in western Kansas to grow your ability to produce American electricity. You know what the answer is from this administration? You know what the answer is from environmental groups? You know what the answer is? They said: No, we don't want your jobs. We don't want 1,900 jobs in western Kansas.

We have rural communities all across western Kansas, and they depend on this power. Actually, if they don't have more electricity, we will begin to see brownouts in less than a decade in a rural area.

We are trying to grow our production of energy, of coal-fired electrical power, and this administration says: No, we're going to sue you. And the EPA says: No, we're going to stop you with new regulations. Various outside groups are throwing lawsuits. It is death by litigation. And that is not only stopping our power plants. They are stopping power plants all across the country.

Now, it is hard to understand. I talk to my constituents and they say: Why can't we have more electricity? Who is opposed to this? Who is opposed to jobs? Somebody in Washington is opposed to jobs. There are regulators all over this country, particularly in our Nation's capital, who say: No, I would rather you pay for \$5 gasoline. No, I would rather you have higher electricity rates.

If we don't generate more electricity in my State, in western Kansas, they anticipate a 40 to 50 percent increase in electricity rates. But by the time that would happen, 4 or 5 years from now, they'll say: Why didn't you do something about it? That is why I am here tonight. We have to do something about it now.

Our competitors across the way in China, I believe they have figured it out. They recognize that you need more energy in whatever form. We need more energy. We need to produce more electricity. We need to produce more diesel fuel and more gasoline. We need an all-of-the-above strategy. But when you have an administration and a culture in Washington that is dedicated to eliminating access to energy, when you have an Energy Secretary that suggests that Americans need to pay \$5 a gallon on gasoline, our Energy Secretary suggests that we need to pay \$5 a gallon on our gasoline, what is going on?

We need to pay more? No, we need to pay less. And the way we do that is not having a brand-new policy, a new program in Washington. No, we need to let American entrepreneurs continue to do what they have been doing for years, and that is producing a needed product called energy. And we can produce it in many ways in Kansas and all throughout the Midwest and all throughout the Nation. But when you have this narrow agenda of those in Washington that have dedicated their lives to make certain that our electrical prices go up, our energy prices in all forms go up, that is going to cost us more unless we can turn on the entrepreneurs.

□ 1940

Actually, there was a report from our U.S. Chamber of Commerce—and there are folks in this town who get upset when you talk about people who create jobs because it is actually the private sector that creates jobs. It estimates there are 351 stalled energy projects across America, and the one in western Kansas, Sunflower Electric Cooperative, is just one of those, but there are 350 others. They estimate that if those stalled energy projects would move forward that they would create 2 million jobs in the short term just in construction, but in the long term, they would create affordable energy to allow us to compete across the world. Frankly, as our energy prices increase, our ability to compete and export and to compete with China and many other countries is incredibly diminished.

So we need—we must—and are responsible here in this Chamber for freeing up entrepreneurs. We are responsible for forcing the U.S. Senate to come to the table and actually do what they talked about doing.

I don't think there is a Member of Congress in the House or Senate who went home and said, Do you know what I like? I like high energy prices.

Nobody said that. No.

They went home, and said, We're doing everything we can.

They're not doing everything they can. The U.S. Senate is not doing a single thing to help this along, and the administration is doing everything it can to make sure our energy prices go up.

That's so frustrating to me because we do have an easy answer. Let's let American entrepreneurs, American en-

ergy companies—basically small businesses—move forward. In my district, we are heavily dependent on agriculture, but the second largest industry is the oil and gas industry, and we must continue to encourage them to move forward.

I appreciate the opportunity to visit about this tonight. It's something I am very passionate about because the people in this House who are working for it cannot be blamed for high energy prices in the future, because we are doing what we can do today. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Thank you, the gentleman from Kansas.

You hit on something. Obama's Energy Secretary, Steven Chu, before he was nominated to be the Secretary of Energy, wanted to figure out how to boost the price of a gallon of gasoline in this country to the levels in Europe. At the time he made that statement, gasoline in Europe cost around \$7 to \$8 a gallon. That's what the administration's Secretary of Energy really expects and wants the American people to pay for a gallon of gasoline. When fuel prices got to be \$4 a gallon—\$4.35, \$4.50 a gallon—in August of 2008, I know what that meant for my small business, and we only had two trucks on the road. Americans can't afford that when we've got the resources here in this country to meet our energy needs.

I know that the gentlewoman from North Carolina fully understands that we've got the resources to meet our needs and that we've got to expand that and put Americans back to work through harvesting American resources. So I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for taking on this Special Order tonight and for bringing with him a group of his colleagues who are called "freshmen" around here, but I will tell you the people watching this tonight don't know you guys are freshmen. You're doing a wonderful job, and I want to compliment you on the fantastic job you've taken on here to explain to the American people some of the issues related to energy independence.

I was home, like you were, during the Fourth of July and Independence Day, the little break that we had. I was home, talking to people about the fact that we need to declare a new war for independence, and that is a war for energy independence. So I agree with all of the comments that you all have made, and I want to piggyback on what our colleague from South Carolina was talking about.

In April 2011, families spent an average of \$369 each month on gasoline, which represented 8.9 percent of monthly household income, which was an increase from the average of 5.7 percent. Now, that is hurting the people in my district, and it is hurting the people in your district.

We need to continue to point out that this administration has created these problems. These weren't created by Republicans. Democrats were in control of the Congress from January of 2007 to January of 2011. We were in the minority during those 4 years. In the last 2 years, the President and the Democrats were in charge of the entire Congress. They have the responsibility for what has happened in terms of energy prices.

What Republicans have done in the last 4 years, as well as this year, is we have put forth and passed legislation that would eliminate needless permitting delays that have stalled energy production. We have put forward commonsense solutions to these high energy prices. Again, we believe in an all-of-the-above principle. We want to see us have all of the things that we need in this country to make us energy independent.

Our government should be promoting our energy resources, not blocking their development. If we don't do that, we are going to continue to have a 9 percent unemployment rate. As for all of the comments that have been made about what producing energy in this country can do to unemployment, we must do that, and until we get an administration that understands that and a larger number of people in Congress who understand that, American families are going to be hurting.

So I want to compliment all of you tonight who have come here and spoken out about these issues.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas. He comes from an energy background—supplying parts to the energy production field.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I just want to say a couple of things quickly.

I had a chance to hear, speaking before me, the gentleman from Oklahoma, who was talking about drilling and service companies. Until just over 6 months ago, I ran one of those small companies. It created energy jobs in Kansas and in Oklahoma and in Midland, Texas, and in Kilgore, Texas, and in all the places where American energy can be produced for American consumers. It's not that hard. This President just makes it so. We know we can have safe, clean, affordable energy produced here in America by American innovators, American businesses and American jobs if we will just do the simple things and get the Federal Government out of the way.

Just a few minutes ago, my colleague from Kansas spoke about a power plant in his district in Kansas that we've been trying to build with clean coal technology. We've been trying to build it for years. It's cleaner than the plant that exists today. It will reduce overall emissions in the State of Kansas; yet this administration and our previous Governor, who is now the Secretary of Health and Human Services, just says, No. Don't produce that energy. Don't

produce that affordable energy so we can build things here in America.

I was just talking to my colleague from Colorado about that very same power plant and what it does to his State, the State of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank both the gentlemen from Kansas, my neighbors to the east of Colorado.

When you talk about the Holcomb plant, you're talking about something that affected Colorado, my constituents, directly. My district borders western Kansas, and many of the farmers/ranchers who rely on rural electric supplies for their energy were going to rely on that plant. Their ability to get cheap, abundant, affordable energy from that plant was critical to the future of their operations. I know they continue to work on it and will continue to work with their neighbors in Kansas on that. So it doesn't just affect one State. This is a national issue: the ability to generate abundant, affordable energy.

I'll also point out that those same communities in southeastern Colorado were hoping to build wind farms. Do you know what? They also rely on transmission lines, and with that power plant came transmission lines—the ability to get power from point A to point B, from where the resource is to where the people live. So, once again, we have a need for a source of abundant, affordable energy.

Mr. POMPEO. I know we're wrapping up here tonight, but I want to talk about one more thing and how the President's policies and his Environmental Protection Agency are destroying jobs in Kansas.

In Kansas' Fourth Congressional District, we build an awful lot of airplanes. They need an awful lot of electricity to build those planes and to run those plants. Our agriculture community also depends on having the EPA out of the way. Today, I sat in a hearing where the Democrats continued to say we need tighter utility regulations, that we need a set of utility rules that will make it almost impossible to build a new utility plant in America. We need that energy. When we don't have that energy, prices and costs for our farmers go up, and that translates very directly. It translates into the cost of food at the table.

When I talk to seniors, they say, MIKE, we know what we spend money on. We spend it on the simple things. We spend it on food and energy to heat our homes.

If we keep these policies up, we will be pricing our seniors into a place no one wants them.

□ 1950

It doesn't have to be. We have American energy; we can get it.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. We're about out of time. I just wanted to thank my colleagues for understanding and expressing very clearly that we have the resources in this

country to meet our energy needs. We need to put America back to work, harvesting those as a segue to job creation. The House Energy Action Team, the committees charged with this, have passed the bills to the Senate. The Senate needs to act. Let's put America back to work solving our energy needs.

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

DEBT CEILING LIMIT TALKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this evening it is my pleasure to initiate discussion as to the events here in Washington as they affect our debt ceiling limit.

There is much attention being paid to the efforts for America to pay her bills, and obviously America's working families understand what it's all about. They understand that you work hard, you roll up your sleeves, you make ends meet, and you pay your bills on time.

Well, the concern we have today is that as we attempt to get that phenomenon done—as we have many times over the last several years—the bills have been rung up, perhaps by those Members of Congress before us and by administrations before us; but nonetheless, they are bills that need to be paid. And as we go forward, I think it's important for us to recognize that the honorable thing to do is to acknowledge that we need to pay those bills so as not to accrue additional interest charges, pay them as soon as we can, and make certain that we don't draw all sorts of havoc and damage to the American economy and perhaps the international economy as we move forward with the saga of being able to pay our bills with a debt ceiling limit being addressed.

Now, many Presidents have asked for this opportunity so as to be responsible in their administrative role, in their executive role. This President has now been addressing this issue. And we have brought in discussion to enable to authorize that debt ceiling limit being adjusted, that it should be accompanied by spending cuts. And so it has created a certain give and take, a tug of war, so to speak, here in Washington to enable us to pay those bills and have the ceiling limit addressed.

An agenda is being attached that would include spending cuts, spending cuts that in some ways can devastate the working families of this Nation, an assault on many of the needs that they have.

There is, with the Ryan plan—that now has become the "Republican plan," as it has been passed by this House—would address Medicare as we know it. It would end Medicare, a program that was initiated back in 1965,

took hold about 45 years ago in 1966, and has addressed the economic vitality of many senior households since that time.

Prior to that legislation for Medicare, many of the seniors were victimized, not being able to access that sort of care, not having the health care plans they required. The industry would cherry pick; they would take certain elements of a senior population that were a safer risk, an easier risk. And when it came to affordability, again, a drain on the economic vitality of retirees. Those who would retire at a certain level of economic viability would have that situation dip southward as their medical costs would drain those retirement savings.

And so history has shown that that economic vitality of our senior community has stayed more constant, more durable since the time of Medicare. It has enabled a cushion, a security to be there for our senior population so as they advanced into their golden years, they would have that coverage that was so essential.

There is this correlation of the need for health care with growing older. That's easily understood. And so what we needed was a plan that would provide security and stability, and we found it, and the Nation celebrated in bipartisan fashion. And for decades we have improved the system and addressed it so as to meet the needs of our Nation's seniors.

And now, as we look to address a debt ceiling limit, discussions have brought in a cutting services agenda where we are going to deny certain programs, amongst them Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid being reduced, programs that speak to core needs—Pell Grants for higher education, education aid and Head Start for our youngsters, the workforce of the future. A number of issues under attack, an assault on the middle class, programs that are required for working families, for their children, for seniors, for veterans, for establishment of jobs.

To create a jobs agenda, we need oftentimes to invest. Also at a time when we're asked to invest in a clean energy and innovation economy because there is a global sweepstakes going on amongst the world nations to compete for clean energy with investments that are required for R&D, and you name it, so as to develop that soundness of an agenda and create jobs here, utilizing and embracing the American intellect.

So all of that is put at risk by this frenzy to have spending cuts while we authorize this debt ceiling limit, which allows us, authorizes us to pay our bills, has the executive branch pay its bills, has this country pay its bills, as the President has suggested time and time again.

But the outcome is that many are thinking this is giving us new authorization to spend when in fact it covers the bills of the past. And to accompany their vote here, they would want spending cuts. And so Medicare has

been on that block; it has been on that chopping block, and many of my colleagues are concerned about that.

We're joined tonight by my colleague from California, who represents, I believe, the 32nd District of the State of California, Representative JUDY CHU, who has been outspoken in her defense of maintaining the Medicare program, improving it, strengthening it, providing greater opportunity for generations of seniors yet to come, and not ending it. Ending Medicare would be a torturous thought for many out there. And there are those who defend the program here in the House, amongst them Representative JUDY CHU.

Representative CHU, thank you for joining us this evening, and I welcome your thoughts on where we're at as we address these debt ceiling limit negotiations and now having these demands of spending cuts put upon us that could impact the senior population via the end to Medicare.

Ms. CHU. Thank you, Congressman TONKO. Thank you for putting this hour together for us to talk about what is at stake with regard to Medicare.

The economic recession is hurting our seniors. The programs they rely on to get by, like Nursicare and Meals on Wheels, are being slashed at the local, State and Federal level. Though prices have risen, they haven't seen a cost-of-living increase in their Social Security checks. Yet the Republicans have been in control of the House for over 6 months and have done nothing to help our struggling seniors. Instead, they have been waging a war on programs that keep them afloat.

First, they pushed through a budget for next year that ends Medicare. It would deny seniors and those of us who are getting older what was a 50-year health care guarantee, one that we have been paying throughout our lives.

Today, under Medicare you are guaranteed coverage the day you turn 65 and for the rest of your life. You can get free preventive care. You can get a 50 percent discount on brand-name prescriptions if you are in the doughnut hole. But now the Republicans are trying to take all that away. The GOP wants to replace Medicare with a voucher system where seniors, once they turn 67, go out into the private market to buy their own health insurance. That puts seniors at the mercy of insurance companies instead of in control of their own care.

We've seen that private insurers will line their pockets rather than provide quality and secure health care. Insurance companies could limit benefits, raise copays, and change which doctors are in their network, none of which occur under Medicare today.

□ 2000

The proposal, rather than tackling skyrocketing health care costs, simply shifts these costs onto the backs of seniors in Medicare. And because the amount of the Medicare voucher won't be tied to rising health care costs, sen-

iors will be forced to shoulder the burden as health care costs increase. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, in just 10 short years, out-of-pocket health care expenses for a typical 65-year-old will double under the Republican budget. And in 2030, a new retiree will be paying over \$20,000 out of pocket for medical expenses. Rather than fixing our fiscal problems, it just makes seniors pay the bill.

Proponents voted to end Medicare for our seniors because they say we can't afford it. But they're openly pushing for even more budget-busting millionaire tax giveaways. In the same budget that ends Medicare as we know it and makes seniors pay double the health care costs, Big Oil gets tax subsidies, millionaires get tax breaks, and corporations have to pay less taxes. And now we're hearing that Republicans want to make massive cuts in Medicare as payment for their votes on the debt ceiling. Some have proposed requiring Medicare beneficiaries to pay even more for their Medicare benefits, either through higher copays or through higher premiums.

The solution is fixing the real problem of increasing health care costs for all Americans, not shifting cost burdens on our seniors. That's not going to work for the 40 million seniors enrolled in the program who have Medicare for their health and economic security.

But that's not all. Next week, Republicans are going to push through a constitutional amendment to the floor that will force the deepest cuts in Medicare yet. This so-called "balanced budget amendment" is just pulling the rug from under the seniors in the name of cutting spending. This amendment is designed to make it easier to reduce the deficit by slashing Medicare benefits rather than by closing tax loopholes for private jets. The way the bill is written, we'd have to privatize Medicare completely and raise its eligibility age to 67.

By forcing Congress to keep spending at unheard of levels, we would inevitably shift the real economic burdens onto the backs of our Nation's most vulnerable, the elderly. It would make it virtually impossible to repeal special tax breaks for the wealthy or Big Oil and gas producers. But it would allow Congress to destroy Medicare with a simple voice vote.

Well, I think that our Federal debt and budget is more than just about dollars and cents. The way we spend our money is a statement of our values and priorities. Republicans want us to believe that cutting benefits to seniors is the only way we can solve our debt crisis, but I say there are other ways. The debt must be addressed, but it should be done in a way that's fair to all. Today the average senior lives on \$19,000 a year, just \$19,000. We should not balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's seniors. We must protect and strengthen Medicare, not gut it. These talks are about priorities. And

my priority is keeping seniors in their own homes, communities, and off the streets.

Mr. TONKO. Representative CHU, you raised an interesting fact with the end to Medicare proposed by the Republicans in the House. The cost shifting that takes hold, it's about a two-thirds/one-third split today. And the out-of-pocket expenses to a senior at times—as you pointed out, \$19,000 as an average income—even those out-of-pockets for the one-third today can be rather demanding. But to shift that now to flip it to one-third/two-thirds, where 32 cents on the dollar would be what you're provided with your voucher—as you suggested, through the course of time, it will not reflect accurately well enough the growth in health care costs because they don't index it correctly.

So you start with a one-third burden of what government will contribute. That means 68 cents out of pocket for seniors. I don't know how they would afford it. I represent a disproportionately high number of senior citizens in the 21st Congressional District in New York State. This would be a drain on many households. And when we see the costs that some of them would have to absorb, with pharmaceutical costs that enable them to either recover or at least live in some sort of dignified manner, it is really a strong concern.

And for the groups who are proposing this to have the audacity to suggest that it's what Congress gets—when Congress is getting 72 cents, I believe, on the dollar for their health care coverage, so for every dollar of premium that they pay, 72 cents is covered, as opposed to the 32 cents they would have go the way of senior citizens—nothing could be farther from factual than what they portray here. So this is a cost shifting that is a very painful measure.

We've had a program that's worked so well that seniors in my district say, Hands off my Medicare. Hands off the Medicare. If you want to do anything, make it even stronger. Protect that Medicare program. But that, for 45 years, has worked so well and has worked in a way that has addressed the dignity of seniors in their retirement years. So Representative CHU, we thank you for your participation here this evening.

We've been joined by another colleague, from the State of Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS. I believe it's Maryland's Fourth District, Representative EDWARDS?

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. It is Maryland's Fourth Congressional District, which is just outside of the Nation's Capital. But I can tell you that in the Fourth Congressional District in Maryland, just like across the country, people in my congressional district are just stymied at the idea that we would in any way reduce Medicare benefits—

Mr. TONKO. Or end them.

Ms. EDWARDS. That we would end them, that we would shift costs on

things like Medicaid to our States, that we would reduce benefits for Social Security, all of this in the context of a conversation about lifting a debt ceiling and making cost cuts to things that impact our debt, our long-term debt and our deficits.

I just wanted to point out to the gentleman, most Americans don't know this, but I think they need to understand that, as you can see here from this chart, that the largest portion of our long-term debt is caused by the Bush-era tax cuts, not by Medicare and not by Social Security. Now to be sure, one might argue, I think that we need to make sure that Medicare and Social Security are solvent for generations to come because we want to honor the contract that I've made with my mother, that my son has made with me. But that shouldn't be anywhere near this conversation about lifting the debt ceiling because it isn't the burden of seniors and those with disabilities to bear the burden of paying for these Bush-era tax cuts for those who make over \$250,000 instead of shifting that burden where it really needs to be.

Mr. TONKO. Representative EDWARDS, when you talk about this debt, I think we need to state too very clearly that these were off-budget. All of these tax cuts, the wars during those Bush years were paid for by borrowing, and we borrowed from China and other nations totally to pay for this because they were totally off-budget. So people need to know, this debt ceiling limit authorization is to pay for bills that have accrued from decisions made in administrations prior to this and perhaps sessions of Congress that came far before the 112th session of Congress. So it is an authorization to pay bills. And in order to get that approval, there are many who are suggesting we have to cut spending, including ending Medicare.

Ms. EDWARDS. Right. And I think that you were right to correct me. I mean, I think sometimes even I would like to think that perhaps what we're talking about with the Ryan budget that we've heard so much about and with these other ideas is about changing Medicare. But it's actually not about changing Medicare. You're right. It's about ending Medicare, turning it into a system where our seniors and those with disabilities would just kind of get, you know, a check or a voucher and then have to go negotiate with their insurance companies.

Well, I have to tell you, although my mother's a pretty tough negotiator, it would be tough for me to imagine her and other seniors around this country having to negotiate a better health care cost and to navigate that system by negotiating with insurance companies. I think the only one who wins in that game are the insurance companies.

□ 2010

Mr. TONKO. Again, if you would suffer an interruption, when we talk

about the beginning days of Medicare, the propensity to do something then would become the same cause today, because people were being impacted by cherry picking, by unaffordable rates, by inaccessible outcomes, where there was absolutely no desire to write a policy for some. And as we look at that age curve rise exponentially, I mean the life expectancy, I believe, in 1965 was 70 years of age. That has grown tremendously. And so now you are going to have more and more people living longer, and we need to help strengthen Medicare. But to end it at a time when people would go back to this rat race of trying to find someone to cover you, it puts the insurance company back in the driver's seat. Seniors would have precious little control over their destiny.

And what I think can be documented clearly from that time in 1965, 1966 is that the economic vitality of senior households, that durability of their income status was held harmless with Medicare. And it used to dip south because health care costs would drain those retirement incomes in some format that would really impoverish our senior community. We're going to head back into the disaster of pre-1965.

Ms. EDWARDS. If the gentleman would yield, I think you point exactly to what the problem is: that rather than our seniors facing their older age with some degree of certainty about being able to meet their health care needs, instead we throw them out to the wolves. This plan would throw them out to the wolves. And I know that's why the gentleman from New York and this gentlewoman from Maryland and all across, frankly, our Democratic Caucus we stand very firmly united behind protecting Medicare benefits from those kinds of cuts and, really, from demolishing the program.

After all, can you imagine that if you were—I just turned 53. And that for those of us who were under age 55, that we would have to, starting now, dig into our pockets, saving up to \$6,000 a year so that we could actually pay for costs. That would mean that between now and the time of my retirement, I would have to save up to almost \$200,000 to be able to meet those costs. And this at an age when I should be thinking about how I have saved up to this point to have a more comfortable retirement.

Well, that's the predicament that the Ryan budget that was passed by the majority in this Congress in April, that would be the result. Now, we may not know all the dirty details of the proposals that some on the other side have for Medicare in the context of this debt ceiling, but we can only imagine that if their true gift that they wanted to give to the American public and give to our seniors was a plan that would decimate Medicare, I can only imagine what the ideas are for so-called cost savings, which could be quite devastating for our seniors as they look to increase out-of-pocket costs.

And let's think about Medicare for a minute. Because what a lot of people don't understand is they get caught in this business of discussing things like the Consumer Price Index. Well, you know, adjusting things like that is just a fancy way for saying "cuts." So I like to use the one syllable word "cuts" to describe what has been on the table for Medicare. Cuts that would result in our seniors having to meet more of the expenses for their health care out of their pockets.

I have talked to seniors in my congressional district who told horrifying stories about how challenging it is for them to meet their day-to-day needs, and that they live and rely almost exclusively on Social Security and on Medicare for their health care coverage. They even do things like, to save money, to save money on their prescription drugs, you know, they may split that heart medication in half. Well, consider, if you will, that if some of these proposals were to go into effect that rather than even splitting that pill in half they would be splitting it in thirds. I mean, this would have a devastating impact on our seniors.

Some have suggested, and the gentleman from New York understands this, that these are about scare tactics. Well, the seniors in my district don't need a scare tactic; they just need the facts. And the facts are that those on the other side, in exchange for providing this huge orange clump here in Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, those 2 percenters who make over \$250,000 a year, rather than have them pay their own way, we want to tell our seniors, Dip into your own pocket and meet your health care costs. Negotiate with health insurance companies, when we know that as you age things happen. And they would just say, No, can't cover you or, if we can, it would be for a real premium.

This would be devastating to the Nation's seniors.

I think the thing that I most admire about those who first enacted Medicare is that it really was about how we feel about one neighbor to the next, one generation to the next, that bond that we have that says we actually care about each other and meeting our health care costs, that we don't want seniors left out in the cold when it comes to their health care in their golden years. I want to keep that promise. And I know the gentleman from New York wants to keep it, too.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. Representative EDWARDS, you struck on a chord that is just repeated over and over again in my district. Many thought, well, if the seniors are told that this will affect senior communities into the future, that they will get buy-in from today's senior citizens. I am impressed with the very generous statements made, the advocacy embraced by our senior community of today saying, This has served me so well, I don't want it denied my children or my grandchildren.

And as you pointed out, you know, a 54-year-old of today will have to save about \$182,000 out of her or his pocket in order to pick up the slack that would be part of this shop on your own, you know, putting the insurance companies back into control. The senior's going to get a voucher that covers a third of the costs that they need to have health care coverage and then dig into their pockets for the rest. So that means a 54-year-old of today will have to save \$182,000, but then the 30-year-old will have to save \$400,000.

Where are we going with this? This is all to cut a program that has served, with dignity, the senior community of this country, all to pay for the Bush-era tax cuts. So this is a way of sliding savings by ending Medicare and bringing it over to pay for millionaire and billionaire tax cuts and for subsidies to oil companies. This is as vulgar as it can get.

And to attach this to a discussion on debt limit, where we look for authorization to pay our bills, just like America's working families roll up their sleeves, earn that money and pay their bills, they expect the government to do the same thing. And to play a game on Medicare where you deny access and affordability for a basic core human need after a record of tremendous performance since 1966 is, I think, so objectionable that it's no wonder when we go home, when you go to Maryland, when I go back to upstate New York, people are saying, Hands off my Medicare.

Ms. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Ms. EDWARDS. They are saying it with good reason. It's because it's worked. It's because our seniors are no longer wondering in their golden years whether they will be able to meet their health care needs. It's because our seniors and their families are not struggling to make sure that those health care needs are met.

It would be one thing if we were arguing about a program that was inefficient and not cost-effective. But every single piece of data about Medicare tells us it's more efficient than the private sector, that in terms of its cost-effectiveness it's more cost-effective than the private sector. And what I like is that when we passed the Affordable Care Act, and the gentleman will remember this, is that we actually did some things to really strengthen Medicare. I am proud of that.

And I do want to have the discussion about making sure that we strengthen, for future generations, Medicare, Social Security, these important safety net programs. I don't know about your district, the gentleman's district, but I know that in my district in Maryland people have lost their 401(k) plans. They've lost their private pensions to the extent that they have had them. They've lost value in their homes.

□ 2020

The only thing they have left in their golden years is their retirement, their

Medicare, and their Social Security; and they are counting on us to protect that.

And perhaps it is that unfortunately this debate about raising the debt ceiling, which I think is an imperative, a moral imperative for us to do, has actually crystallized the bright line between those of us who want to protect Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid and those who want to destroy it, those who have long held the belief that these systems should be privatized, as though somehow that market that fell apart yesterday, if we were investing there, that that would protect people's retirement security when all of us, each of us knows that that won't be true.

And so I am interested in making sure that the 2 percenters, those who make over \$250,000, should not have to put the cost and have the cost shifted to our seniors to bear the costs for their tax breaks for corporate loopholes and for things that our seniors didn't have anything to do with, and that's why I like the bright line test of those of us who want to protect Medicare for future generations and those who want to destroy it.

Mr. TONKO. Very well said, Representative EDWARDS, and I just want to attach my comments to yours about the impact of Medicare, an investment that has produced a lucrative dividend. We have kept the dignity factor alive for seniors, we have kept our seniors well, we have enabled them to recover, we have enabled them to live because of an attachment to our health care plan.

On the other side, we have allowed for spending for a tax cut for millionaires and billionaires, spending on a tax cut for millionaires and billionaires time and time again, knowing that the result is no real lucrative dividend, negligible. We look at not only the spending that people acknowledge was okay for something not returning a dividend, we lost 8.2 million jobs in the Bush recession, but then we borrowed all the money to spend, needed to spend, for that tax cut.

What a contrast. And the Democrats in this House have said, no, let's do programs that have a return. Let's invest in our senior community and let's not spend on these tax cuts that have no dividend, no lucrative dividend.

And if we didn't have the money to spend for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, why then did we go and borrow from China and Saudi Arabia?

So it makes very little sense to follow that road to ruin which the Republican plan, once the Ryan plan, now speaks to.

We have been joined by Representative JACKSON LEE from the State of Texas. Welcome, Representative, and thank you for joining in the discussion on the attempts here to end Medicare and to allow for those savings to go toward spending on tax cuts that get somehow attached to a discussion on the debt ceiling, the debt ceiling being

raised so that America can pay her bills. It's convoluted at best.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I am so glad to have the opportunity to join the gentleman from New York and to specifically focus on his leadership, along with my colleague from Maryland, who, as we were developing the Affordable Care Act, worked so hard on some of these finite issues ensuring that we had the oversight over insurance rates.

We tried to do everything that we could to produce legislation that embraced the concept of Medicare, for example, recognizing and respecting Medicare and then broadening the concept to ensuring that all people had access to health care. But isn't it interesting just a few months later we are standing in the well of the House and we are literally having to hang on to the commonsense program of Medicare.

If I could, I would like to frame the discussion in this manner. You have articulated a very commonsense approach that in any debt ceiling—by the way, let me give my editorial comment. I have voted for a clean debt ceiling just simply to pay America's bills. Unfortunately, that didn't carry the weight of the day.

But what I will say is that the discussions that are being crafted in the media, or at least have been perceived in the media that our Republican friends want to provide to the American people, is that we are broke, is that we have no way of doing anything.

I want to be very clear, I am aware that Americans are out of work. I am aware that we have had 6 months without a jobs bill and that Democrats are trying to put one on the floor.

But I want everyone to know that we have had a significant recovery because of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. So we are moving forward except for the fact that we have got to get jobs. We have had seven consecutive quarters where the GDP has grown.

So to make our seniors the brunt of what we have made up in terms of saying we have no money, we cannot think any other way, we have to hit someone who has paid their dues, if you will, is simply wrong and unfair.

As I have said, we are not where we want to be, but the sacrifices that Democrats have made in the Recovery and Reinvestment Act have put us forward. In addition, we have seen growth.

Now we have a budget. First of all, we started off in 2011 with a budget, a Ryan budget, that then suggested that we were so broke we had to voucher Medicare. Frankly, vouchering Medicare is extinguishing Medicare. It's eliminating Medicare as we know it. It is telling a senior that you need a dollar's worth of health care, we can give you a quarter. We are going to give a senior who has invested in America, who has worked all of his or her life, who, as my colleague has said, maybe has fallen on difficult times with a 401(k) and certainly that is because

markets have gone up and markets have gone down, and you are going to say now you are going to get a quarter.

Now bring us forward. That bill, of course, was passed by the House, predominantly Republican, with any number of Members who believe there is nothing wrong with that. It has gone nowhere in the Senate. Now we are at a crucial point where the President has asked for us all to be adults, to sit around the table and talk about how can we work this together.

Can we do it with the airplanes and jets? Can we let the Bush tax cuts expire? Can we call upon our friends in the energy industry that is leaps and bounds in profits to craft or to understand a way that we can recraft those particular provisions to bring that money here into the Federal Government?

And I would say to my good friends in business, where it might be, the climate of the United States allows you to thrive. You are doing better because you live in a democracy, you live in a place where we respect property, where we don't run into a corporation and say, you know what, I think I am going to take about, you know, half a trillion dollars from you if you have that much. Just send that check over to the United States Treasury.

We don't do that.

So I want the point to be made tonight that we are on the side of the angels, because it is absolutely ludicrous to not see the difference in life span pre-1965, before Lyndon Baines Johnson, a fellow Texan, announced his desire in the Great Society to find a way to, in essence, respect the senior citizens, the elderly. And at that time he was probably looking at individuals in their 60s because of the wear and tear and the lack of health care to be able to give them an extra lifeline.

To say that he was right and to make sure, I just want to add these points as I come to a close, to be able to suggest that the millions of seniors who now have access to guaranteed benefits are in jeopardy because of the games that are being played about the debt ceiling, a simple, procedural vote, if you will, that allows the debt ceiling to be raised so that we can pay our bills, something that we have done, if I may put in the RECORD, some 74 times since 1962 with no quarrel whatsoever.

Finally, I would argue this: many of those on Medicare are families of veterans, themselves, obviously, may have served, even though I know that they have veterans benefits. But they are people who are willing to sacrifice to build this country. They are seniors.

For us to take away this lifeline is unspeakable. And I hope that as Democrats we will draw a few friends, a few reasonable friends to know that there should be no tying of raising the debt ceiling to Medicare. There should be a tie to raising revenue. That's the commonsense approach to take.

Mr. TONKO. Well said, Representative JACKSON LEE.

You know, for us to now quickly approach this deadline by which the debt ceiling has to be raised and to put the added pressure of ending Medicare into that discussion is vulgar.

□ 2030

Forty-six million Americans are watching this. And they know that they're at risk here simply because people want to unnecessarily attach the end of Medicare into this discussion. And as Representative EDWARDS said earlier, we've improved it with the Affordable Care Act, we've allowed for no deductibles, no copayments for annual checkups and for certain screenings. We're making it stronger. We're trying to get prevention in there to bend that cost curve. Many of us are looking to allow for bulk purchasing of pharmaceuticals, which we do with Medicaid and we do with the VA program. But it was not allowed when the Bush agenda was authorized.

Representative EDWARDS, that chart that you're holding there tonight is still haunting me because I look at all of that debt that was assumed for tax cuts for millionaires that now they want to do again, continue forward, and I look at the wars that were not paid for, I look at the, again, the Medicare part D program that was part of that growth of debt that we're now being asked to pay as the bills have accrued, the interest that we would have to pay if we don't raise that debt ceiling is astronomical.

So, again, we welcome you to the floor this evening on a very important discussion. And your thoughts. You were going into the concerns about Medicare being ended for those that count on you to be their voice here in the House.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you for yielding, and it's wonderful to be able to join my colleague from New York and my colleague from Texas in this discussion.

It's so important for the American people, and I just want to remind my colleagues that 46 million to 47 million people, Americans, rely on Medicare for comprehensive health care coverage. When Medicare was first passed, more than half of those who were over 65 didn't have any health care coverage—more than half. Today, that's not true. Thirty percent of the number of elderly Americans lived in poverty before Medicare, and that number is now reduced to about 7½ percent. So the quality of life and the health care of our seniors has improved radically since Medicare's passage in 1965.

So, what would it really mean to end Medicare? Well, it would mean that those seniors who are out in my congressional district and yours around the country would be subject, once again, to perhaps being one of the more than half of those who would not have comprehensive health care coverage.

And I am struck, as you are, when I look at these lines of what is really causing our long-term debt. And I see

this big orange glob right here into the future, and I realize that it is the Bush-era tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. And I think, how fair is that to our seniors who are living on Medicare and Social Security? I look at the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Some have argued that those wars are really unsustainable into the future, and yet they comprise a substantial portion of our long-term debt because they were never paid for when we began those engagements.

I look at the Troubled Asset Relief Program into the future. But what I see there is that it's this thin bluish line here, the thin one there. And what that means is that we have actually paid that back under the Obama administration and Democratic control of the Congress. And then we have this big glob here that's about the current economic downturn. And it strikes me that if the Congress really wanted to do something, if the majority really wanted to do something, leave Medicare alone, leave Social Security alone and leave Medicaid alone. Don't shift that to the States. Focus on creating jobs and getting 20-some million people back to work so that they can contribute to our tax base, so that they can contribute to Medicare and to Social Security. Do a jobs program, and that will strengthen some of these programs that we care so deeply about.

Mr. TONKO. Congresswoman EDWARDS and Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, I would say, too, that Medicare, yes, speaks to the health care needs of senior households, but there's also a stability there. There's a security so that some of the available expenditures that are out there today from seniors investing in their community, spending in their community, would be lost. And so the economic recovery, then, again, gets threatened.

And when I look at this, all through that blob of color of which you speak, all during that time was like a loss of 8.2 million jobs. So where was the quantifiable benefit of all of this relief to those perched way high on the income ladder? There wasn't a corresponding benefit. So we need to recognize what works and works well. And when Medicare has worked for all these years, why would we threaten it? And what I think bothers me most—I'm on the Budget Committee, and today we had a hearing with Secretary Sebelius. And when you talk about bending that health care cost curve, the Republican plan, after they end Medicare and they toss it to the market for the shopping to be done by our senior community, there's no bending of the cost curve. They're saying sharpen the pencil, bottom-line benefit through competition to help our seniors.

We have watched, Representative JACKSON LEE, since the start of Medicare the private sector insurance costs have risen by over 5,000 percent, that's 5,000 percent. The track record on Medicare, no administrative burden to speak of—no heavy one—no marketing

budget, no wasteful expenditures and no high profit columns, we've seen back-to-back profit columns go out of sight for these industries. And when we look at this, when we say we need to go to the bank to borrow, that's helping the friends in the big bank industry. When we need to put it in the private sector and end Medicare, that's helping the deep pockets of the insurance industry. This is like helping those who are looking for more business at the expense of containing costs, bending a health care curve, providing for dignity for the senior community and shedding a program that has worked for nearly half a century and that people have advocated should be there for their children and their grandchildren and generations yet unborn. That is uniquely American. That's uniquely American. It shows and expresses a degree of sensitivity, of compassion and of ability to make things happen.

A budget, a plan that we put together here is merely a listing of our priorities. What do we deem most essential? And when you can reach 46 million, 47 million people in their golden years and provide guaranteed health care, that ought to be a high priority, not taking the savings of ending Medicare to pay for millionaire tax cuts, billionaire tax cuts, or oil industry handouts. Let's get real. Let's get real here. Let's get compassionate. Let's be understanding that what we're ending has a tremendously sound bit of history.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank you for your passion. What you're saying makes me think what we're doing even to the younger generation because you just made a point that it's lasted for over half a century, if I could use that term, over 50 years. And it is a framework that can be in place for those who are young. And if we take it apart, we will not have this structure that has been helpful. There is no reason to ignore modernizing. We're not against that, looking at ways to improve Medicare. But that's not what our Republican friends are saying. They're talking about ending it as we know it, vouchering it.

And there's a story about the running of the bulls. And frankly, I have this image of a voucher plan, or the plan that will come about through cuts in guaranteed benefits, of the running of the bulls, the running of seniors running toward, trying to get that last voucher that is being handed out, trampling each other because they're seeking that one lifeline that they need.

In addition, we need to be very real about Medicare. Medicare is the infrastructure of our hospital system. You cut into Medicare, you're talking about closing hospitals, you're talking about eliminating physicians, and you're talking about ending care as we know it. Is there any understanding to the fact that we need to be adults and sit down?

When I left my city of Houston, I spoke to my constituents on Sunday. I

held a press conference to indicate my commitment to helping to preserve Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. The idea was that this will impact our city. You will see jobs lost. We have the Texas Medical Center. It will see businesses close and people have the inability to care for themselves or their senior family members.

So this simple issue of a debt ceiling speaks, I think, very eloquently to the need for common sense. And you have laid out very clearly we've had it for this period of time, we've been able to keep a structure that has helped to save lives, it has this amount of life, it can have a longer life as we continue to improve it and to ensure that there is no waste, fraud, and abuse. And for me, I cannot imagine, I cannot imagine a picture of seniors trampling each other to get that last voucher or having to be told by their government, a country that they've served and worked for and raised their children in, there is no room at the inn for you, there's no opportunity for your health care, there's no more Medicare; by the way, we had to pay tax cuts or we had to give the billionaires and rich folk the long period of time of tax holidays, and we just didn't have any opportunity for you.

That is unacceptable. It is un-American. And I think we can do better. And we need to fight to protect Medicare as we are doing as Democrats. And I would encourage and welcome my friends, my Republican friends, to join us in doing the right thing.

□ 2040

Mr. TONKO. The Representative from Texas talked about strengthening and improving Medicare, not ending it.

Some have suggested as much as \$156 billion could be saved by bulk purchasing for our pharmaceutical needs for the program, for Medicare. That also is a savings of probably, I think I've heard, \$27 billion as the number for seniors, themselves, because there is a fraction that they assume in those costs. If we do that, we send over not only the savings for government but we send it over to the senior community, also. And so there are ways to address fraud and inefficiency.

The New York Times reported just a short while ago that there were double chest CT scans being done, CT chest scans being done and that the Federal Government was overbilled by some \$25 million. That's one small example of accountability, or lack thereof, and the need to continually stay vigilant in our efforts to search out fraud and inefficiency.

But take it, make it work, strengthen it and provide for that continuation, just the stability that we can provide to enable seniors to breathe more easily, to know that a basic core need for them that's correlated as they grow older, as any of us grows older, it's correlated that you're going to require that health care attachment.

And how dare we—I say “we”—how dare they, how dare a Republican ma-

majority in this House suggest it's worked well, it's been there for seniors for 46 years, but we're ending it, because we're going to box the situation: if you want your debt ceiling limit to be raised so America can pay her bills, you're going to do it with spending cuts and we're starting with Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid.

Well, isn't that nice? That's a take-it-and-weep scenario, and that is terrible because the people that would weep deserve our voice to be heard resoundingly on the floor, to say we step in and we defend the program and, more importantly, we defend the recipients of the program.

Representative EDWARDS, Maryland's Fourth District Rep.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentlewoman from Texas for pointing out the fallacy of this argument that somehow in this discussion of lifting the debt ceiling, which I believe each of us voted to lift that debt ceiling in a clean vote. We understand that that is our moral responsibility, it's our obligation to meet the full faith and credit obligations of the United States, but that's not what this discussion is, and it is precisely the reason that I caution us against putting into the debt ceiling discussion any changes to Medicare benefits and Social Security benefits and Medicaid. The reason is because, as I've demonstrated by showing this chart, and I would love to say that this is my chart but it's not. It was produced by the independent Congressional Budget Office, and it shows the contributing factors, the significant contributing factors in these colors here of the long-term debt. That's what we're talking about, raising the debt ceiling to meet those obligations that have already been laid out.

Some people have described that those of us who are speaking in favor of Medicare and Social Security and making sure that we protect Medicare and Social Security beneficiaries from cuts, that we're passionate, but that passion is deeply connected to fact. It is connected to the fact that we are passionate about the guaranteed benefit of Medicare. It's connected to the fact that we are committed to lowering prescription drug costs by closing the doughnut hole, whereas the Ryan budget, the Republican budget, would open that doughnut hole all over again for our seniors, causing them to dip into their already fragile pockets to meet their prescription drug needs.

The gentleman from New York has already pointed to ways in which we could actually negotiate prescription drugs in bulk so that we could significantly lower costs for our seniors, but that's not what's on the table. Those of us who are passionate have been described as passionate because we want to ensure that our seniors are receiving primary care, getting preventive care so that it does bend that cost curve. That's the source of our passion, but it's rooted in fact.

And what is really true is the fact that our seniors did not cause the significant factors that are related to our long-term debt. I want to repeat that to the gentleman. I know that you know this, but it's really important for the American people to understand that the contributors to our long-term debt are tax cuts, that are not paid for, for millionaires and billionaires. We should get rid of them. We should not be protecting those tax cuts on the backs of our seniors.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the President has already begun a drawdown. It could be more significant so that we could save in the long run, making certain that we get people back to work so that they are contributing to our tax base in the way that we need. And, of course, we know that we have to raise revenue. We must raise revenue. Our seniors understand that. But what we cannot do is shift the burden for these things that were not caused by seniors onto the backs of our seniors by pushing them into really unfair cuts to their Medicare and Social Security benefits.

Mr. TONKO. Very well said.

We have about 5 minutes left. I'm just going to do a bit of close and then ask for each of our Representatives that remain here on the floor—we were joined earlier by Representative CHU from California—to offer your sentiments, and then we will bring the hour to a close.

What I think is very important to note is that if we can find ways to save on Medicare, we should invest that in Medicare to strengthen Medicare. If we can find ways to save in Social Security, reinvest in Social Security. They deserve to be stand-alones because they are prime, prime opportunities, programs for strengthening the fabric of America's families. So that should be a separate turf and not be using these dollars, these savings as the Republicans would end Medicare, to somehow bring that over in a fungible fashion to pay for these tax cuts.

Today, I talked to my medical colleges, and they are going to get impacted by the cuts to NIH. In New York State, we probably have over a billion dollars in revenue streams that go to hospitals for research. So you cut the NIH program, you put more people out of work, and you cut a revenue stream for hospitals that need to train the human infrastructure that will make all of our health care programs work. Similarly, when you look at our need to compete effectively in a global economy on clean energy and innovation, the winner of that race will be the go-to nation that will create stability for generations of their workers. Why shouldn't America be number one in that investment?

If we can find savings somewhere or if we do create revenues, they need to go into investments to grow jobs. That's what America told us at the polls last November: we want jobs to be the number one priority. We haven't

done a jobs bill in this House; but we've come up and found ways to end Medicare, which right now is so vulnerable to this discussion on the debt ceiling limit. We have to end that crazy plan, and we need to go forward with a sensible plan that enables us to invest in jobs, invest in our senior community, invest in their well-being and to again see these two programs worthy of saving and strengthening; and if we have the economic means, let's do it.

Representative JACKSON Lee, we will go to you and then to Representative EDWARDS, and we will be done with our hour.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much for leading us in this discussion.

The message should be albeit we have some concerns, we are not broke. We need to fix jobs and investment and we need to save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. They have not contributed to our debt, and we cannot allow seniors to run like bulls to seek medical care in this great and wonderful country. I, for one, will not stand for it.

Thank you.

Mr. TONKO. And now to Representative EDWARDS, and then we will be through.

□ 2050

Ms. EDWARDS. Well, I thank you, and I thank the gentleman for bringing us together.

I hope what the American people understand is that the Democrats in this House are prepared to protect Medicare benefits and Social Security benefits for our seniors and for future generations; that our young people should know that as they enter the workforce, because we are going to make sure that they have jobs for the future, that they will be contributing to Medicare and Social Security for future generations.

This is really a values test. This is where we have to have the perfect alignment of policy, of politics, and our values, and that rests in protecting Medicare and Social Security from benefits cuts.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much.

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

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to bring to the attention of this body some subject matter that doesn't often get a debate here on the floor but it does get some discussion in Special Order time and sometimes in the 1-minute and 5-minutes that Members present to you here in this great deliberative place that we have the privilege to serve in.

One of the things that I wanted to bring before your attention here this evening is the immigration issue here in the United States. It is something that I don't know has been discussed here for some time. I bring this forward because it is an important issue. It is essential that we maintain and sustain and enhance the rule of law here in the United States. So I bring this forward. A number of things are on my mind.

The first thing that comes to mind for me is a subject that was reported on Fox News on July 11. I picked up this article and I wanted to express this to you on what is going on.

I introduced early in January, one of the first days of business here in this new 112th Congress, the Birthright Citizenship Act of 2011. Mr. Speaker, I brought this act forward working with people who have been leaders on this issue for some time. One of them would be our friend, Nathan Deal, now Governor Deal of Georgia, who was the lead on this issue when he served in the United States Congress. And some of the successor people involved would be Congressman PHIL GINGREY of Georgia and the incoming freshman from Georgia, ROB WOODALL; from California, Congressman GARY G. MILLER, one who has been a strong proponent of the rule of law and standing up for the rights of American citizens. These people and others have been strong supporters of the Birthright Citizenship Act. And because of my role on the Immigration Committee where I have been for now going onto the 9th year, it seemed to be a better fit for me to carry this legislation, so I stepped forward with it because we needed to take a position.

What is going on, Mr. Speaker, is that in the United States of America, there are people who erroneously read the 14th Amendment of the Constitution in the component that addresses what we call birthright citizenship. It says, in the 14th Amendment, that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are American citizens. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are American citizens.

Now, the circumstances are that it has created a misinterpretation. A misinterpretation of this section of the 14th Amendment has created birthright tourism. So we have, you might see a \$30,000 turnkey operation going on where a pregnant woman in China, and she is probably going to have a benefactor that would sponsor this, could receive a turnkey operation for a little tourism trip into the United States, get her on an airplane and smuggle her into the United States one way or another where she would have a baby. She would be 8½ months pregnant or so, theoretically, and have the baby here in the United States. The baby would get a nice, new American birth certificate with his little footprint stamped on it. And then that baby might go back to China with the baby's mother, or the mother might stay here

in the United States with family and friends, whoever might want to harbor that mother and/or child. And when that child is old enough, the child can sponsor the entire family to come in the United States by virtue of that automatic citizenship that is conferred upon a child that is born here to an illegal mother and a who-knows father.

That is going on not just in rare circumstances, and certainly not just with Chinese. In fact, that is not one of the larger numbers. It is happening in this country someplace between 340,000 times a year and 750,000 times a year, Mr. Speaker. We have a people that sneak into the United States for the purpose of having a baby so that baby can become an American citizen.

I believe, as the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH, believes, that citizenship should be precious. It should be precious. It shouldn't be dealt out. It shouldn't be something that you can buy a turnkey ticket to game the system to have a baby that then is automatically an American citizen subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I will argue that Chinese woman that flies into the United States with a \$30,000 turnkey tourism for birthright is not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, not in the way that was envisioned by the people that wrote the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

The 14th Amendment to the Constitution was put in place to guarantee that the babies born to formerly slaves, and then at that time of ratification freed slaves, would be American citizens, that the babies born to the freed slaves would not be denied all of the rights of citizenship as were guaranteed to them in the 13th and 14th Amendments. And it took into account that babies born on Indian reservations, some of them, would have lost their rights, their tribal rights on those reservations if they had become automatic American citizens. So some of the Native Americans said, no, they didn't want that conferred upon them.

The drafters of the 14th Amendment then wrote language in it to preclude automatic citizenship to any Homo sapien that was born within the territory of the United States. They also had to be subject to the jurisdiction thereof. And this Congress went through a great deal of debate in the House and in the Senate on what that actually meant in the clause, "subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

It was not contemplated that the children of diplomats would become automatic American citizens. It was not contemplated that certain Native Americans born on certain reservations would be subject to the jurisdiction thereof and become American citizens. But it was contemplated that the children born to freed slaves would be American citizens.

It is a guarantee, and it was written with a significant amount of wisdom. They could not have anticipated that

America would get so lazy and so lax that this constitutional amendment would drift its way into a practice, an erroneous practice of conferring automatic citizenship on mostly any baby that would be born in America.

Now, here is how it is. If there is a plane flying through the United States, and let's just say this plane is bound from China to Toronto, which does happen, Mr. Speaker. And it was going to be a flight that was going to be a direct flight and drop into Toronto, but because of weather conditions or maybe mechanical problems, it had to land in Chicago. Let's just say if there is a woman pregnant on that plane who is flying into Toronto and the plane lands in Chicago and it is stuck there for mechanical repairs or a weather-related delay and the woman is inside security and has the baby, the baby is not an American citizen. But if she walks through the security, is outside the security during the layover and has the baby out there, this baby is an American citizen.

That is what has been going on in the practice of this automatic citizenship that I think is an erroneous misinterpretation, and I think a willful misinterpretation, or probably more often a lazy misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

And so I have introduced the Birthright Citizenship Act of 2011, along with the friends and colleagues that I have mentioned and many others, and a good number of cosponsors who take the position with me that if a child is born in America, has to be born to at least one legal parent in order to be a citizen of the United States. It is pretty simple. It clarifies the 14th Amendment. It clarifies the clause in the 14th Amendment, "subject to the jurisdiction thereof." Congress has the authority to do that.

I got concerned about this when there were a couple of Senators who were talking about the need to amend the Constitution to fix this problem.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't require a constitutional amendment to fix the automatic citizenship practice that is so flawed that it confers an automatic citizenship on as many as 750,000 babies born to illegal parents here in the United States.

To give you an example, as I said, it's not just a Chinese woman who comes over here, pregnant, to have the baby here—and that happens on a very regular basis. It's often someone who comes in from a neighboring country. We know, of the criminal aliens that are in our prisons, two-thirds of them come from Mexico. One might presume that of a similar number of these automatic citizenship babies also their mothers are citizens of Mexico who are in the United States illegally, having the babies here and picking up that automatic citizenship, that birth certificate. They may or may not go back to their home country, but you can bet

that when the time comes that that child will already be programmed to petition for the family reunification plan, which has our immigration plan in America out of control—out of control.

So what do we do about this?

The Birthright Citizenship Act of 2011.

It should be a simple decision for this United States Congress to address this situation, but some will argue, well, "subject to the jurisdiction thereof" means nothing, that that clause in the 14th Amendment doesn't have meaning; therefore, it requires that they all be citizens. I think that is a very thin and a very marginal argument at best. The clause must mean something.

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," are American citizens. There is a reason that it says: "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof." If everyone born in the territory of the United States is automatically a citizen, you would strike that language from the 14th Amendment "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," and it would simply read: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States" are American citizens. If that were the intent, if that were the understanding of the 14th Amendment, that's what it would have said, Mr. Speaker, but it says: "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof." The definition of that phrase is subject to the interpretation of the understanding of what it meant at the time of the ratification of the 14th Amendment, and it meant that "subject to the jurisdiction thereof" didn't mean that there was going to be automatic citizenship for illegals.

Granted, we didn't have much for immigration laws at the time. There wasn't enough human migration to be very concerned about it, but they clearly didn't intend to confer automatic citizenship on Native Americans born on reservations that were not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. They clearly didn't intend to confer automatic citizenship on the children born to the diplomats or their staff, or for tourists for that matter. I mention the tourism part when I explain what happens if a plane lands in Chicago on its way to Toronto and a baby is born. Which side of the security? Here is automatic citizenship on the U.S. side of the security. That's nuts, Mr. Speaker, but we've gotten lazy and lax with the practice of conferring automatic citizenship.

So people don't challenge it, and I'm really worried about an administration—actually, I've been worried about a couple of those administrations since I've arrived in this town—that doesn't seem to have much vigor for enforcing immigration law. It's pretty frustrating to be here in the United States Congress, pounding away to have to pass legislation to fix something that's just a matter of intellectual laziness; but the people who are enforcing this, the people who are handing out birth

certificates almost like candy, aren't challenging it. They don't have a very good constitutional understanding or there would be some pushback out there from across the countryside.

In the OB ward of the hospitals around the country, they've got to have stacks of these birth certificates, and when a baby is born, it's almost an automatic process. Here is the footprint. Here is the data. Here is the birth certificate. Send that child off. He's an American citizen. What do we suppose happens if a diplomat or the wife of a diplomat or even a staff of the diplomat comes into the hospital to have a baby?

Do they meet them at the door and say, "Do you happen to be a diplomat? Are you here on some kind of foreign immunity, and you're planning on having a baby here, and do you think that baby is going to be an American citizen?"

"No, we're not going to allow it. Citizenship is not going to be cheapened like that."

That doesn't happen, Mr. Speaker. What really happens is the children of diplomats are often conferred with automatic citizenship because the whole system of America is so automatic that any baby born inside the U.S. territory is just given the paperwork and the documents.

Here is an article that came out on Fox News, as I mentioned a little bit earlier, reported on July 11—by good, thorough people, I might add. This is Elizabeth Robichaux Brown who has written this article.

The Center for Immigration Studies says: "Foreign diplomats are obtaining U.S. birth certificates and Social Security numbers for their newborn children—effectively becoming U.S. citizens. On top of their new status in the world, these children carry an additional perk that most Americans do not have—diplomatic immunity." So it creates what the CIS describes as a "super citizen." Just like their parents, most are immune to the criminal jurisdiction of the United States, creating super citizens. These super citizens are, of course, children of diplomats, and all they need to have is a U.S. birth certificate and a Social Security number, and they're effectively American citizens.

Who is going to challenge it? There's no question on the birth certificate that asks the question: Are you a diplomat? Is one of your parents legal? an American citizen, perhaps? Those questions don't get asked. They just routinely stamp those birth certificates and send those children off with automatic citizenship 340,000 to 750,000 times a year—some who are clearly not subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

In fact, in the concluding statement in the article, you've got a statement here from one of the proponents of the policy that I advocate, a statement that says: "Despite Congress' clear intent to not create a completely universal and automatic birthright citi-

zenship policy, the current application of the Citizenship Clause is so lax that the United States has a de facto universal birthright citizenship policy that denies U.S. citizenship by birth to no one, including children born to foreign diplomats."

Mr. Speaker, that has to change. We intend to change that with the Birthright Citizenship Act of 2011—that's H.R. 140—and I intend to be engaged in that and to be helping to move that legislation forward.

It has gotten to the point where the children of diplomats, with diplomatic immunity, are getting automatic American citizenship just because they're born inside the territory of the United States—perhaps not even born on U.S. soil. They might even potentially be born in that sovereign territory of the Embassy itself, and they're still American citizens.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we also have an out-of-control legal immigration system, aside from the illegal immigration, which I talk about quite a lot. If we look back over the last decade, we'll see that we brought in, roughly, one and a quarter legal immigrants a year. Over that last decade, if you would look at the new jobs created by the United States economy, those new jobs created are going to average about one and a quarter million jobs a year. This is before the recession began. These numbers held up then, and they're even stronger now. The new jobs created by the American economy have been almost exactly the same number of jobs that would be taken by the legal immigrants who come into the United States.

If we had shut down, slowed down, the legal immigration in the United States over the last 10 years, there would have been just, say, roughly, 10 million fewer legal immigrants in America, and we'd have 10 million fewer unemployed Americans. That's just a simple way of looking at this. I don't propose that we eliminate all legal immigration, not by any means, Mr. Speaker. What I do propose is that we do an economic analysis of this. When we look at real numbers of testimony that have come before the committee, under oath data, here is what we have:

A country should establish an immigration policy that is designed to enhance the economic, the social and the cultural well-being of the United States of America. That should be our task. Yet, with our legal immigration, that legal immigration that is based upon merit, when we take a look at what these individuals have to offer the United States, when we take a look at what they have for capital to invest or their ability to assimilate or their educational background or their relative youth so they've got some years to contribute before they start to draw from the system, these are all logical things that we should ask for.

□ 2110

But it's only between 7 and 11 percent of the legal immigration in America that is based upon anything that has to do with what's good for America. And the balance of it would be 89 to 93 percent of the legal immigration in America is out of the control of the value judgment of the American people, in the hands of the legal immigrants—or sometimes the illegal immigrants—themselves. It's out of our control.

Birthright citizenship is a piece of that that I'm not even sure is part of this equation that I've just described to you. There is a family reunification plan that takes up a big chunk of this, that once someone comes in they can start bringing in their family and their extended family, and it goes out like a tree to no end. We need to limit that family reunification plan. And we need to roll this thing back around and base the legal immigration in America on merit again—what do they have to offer the United States?

And Mr. Speaker, I will say also, we had testimony before the committee, and there were a number of strong faithful representatives that testified there. Some of them are national leaders in the faith community who argued that we need to find a way to accommodate the 11 million to 20 million illegals that are here in America and give them a path to citizenship. And every one of them said that they thought they should go to the back of the line. They should go to the back of the line, the 11 million to 20 million illegals in America should go to the back of the line, but we should give them a means by which they can earn American citizenship. Well, think about it, Mr. Speaker, go to the back of the line. Which line? I asked them, which line? Well, the back of the line. Now that's a talking point that apparently wasn't thought about any deeper than that because if they can't answer the question which line, they surely don't know where that line is. Is it in the United States or is it in lines in the foreign countries, people waiting to come into the United States?

I would submit that if those who are in the United States illegally are to go to the back of the line, it's not a line in the United States. The people in line to come into the United States legally are, by definition, not in the United States. They're outside the United States, they're in their home country, they're following the laws of America, they're lined up to come in the right way—God bless them for doing that. But that line, that line of legal waitees—to maybe coin a phrase—the line of people who are willing to respect American immigration law, get in line and wait in line isn't just some short little old line that you can put 11 million to 20 million people behind and think you're going to process them through. That line of the people who are respecting American laws and are waiting to come into the United States legally, none of them are in the United

States. It's 50 million strong, Mr. Speaker; 50 million people have taken the trouble to line up to try to come into the United States legally.

We are the most generous country in the world by far, letting in around 1.25 million legal immigrants—a very small percentage of them actually come here because of merit, as I said—and meanwhile we've got 11 million to 20 million here in this country that have disrespected our laws. And I would suggest that I would much rather see the 11 million to 20 million who are in the line respecting American laws waiting to come in, I would like to see them come in and become American citizens ahead of those who have disrespected American laws. That sustains the rule of law. That upholds the rule of law. That strengthens us as a Nation. And rewarding law breakers weakens the rule of law and weakens us as a Nation and chisels away at that beautiful marble pillar of American exceptionalism called the rule of law. That's the equation.

And I hear constantly arguments from people that have their own interests, their own viewpoint. They need somebody to milk the cows or they need somebody to take care of their equestrian herd or they need somebody to do their gardening, they need somebody to be their butler or their maid. So they're saying, I can't afford to hire somebody in this country. You need to bring me some cheaper labor.

I would suggest that Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation is right: We have become a welfare state. And a household headed by a high school dropout, without regard to their immigration status, costs the taxpayer annually \$23,449 a year. But it boils down to this: They will draw down \$32,000 a year in benefits—a welfare state—they will pay \$9,000 a year in taxes. And that's the change, that's the difference. And when you multiply it times 50 years of managing the household, being the head of the household, 50 years, it costs the taxpayers an average of \$1.5 million to subsidize that household. And that's a high school dropout. Now it may not get worse when they're an illegal high school dropout, but it doesn't get a lot better. There is a net number, too, that he produces, I think that's around the order of \$19,499 a year. In this area, let's say \$20,000 a year, plus or minus a thousand or two, for a household headed by a high school dropout and/or an illegal immigrant.

Now the burden to the taxpayer, because we're a welfare state, can't be ignored. And the weight on the taxpayers, when we have an oversupply of cheap labor and an undersupply of taxpayers, and 47 percent of households don't pay income tax, we're living in a welfare state, and we're giving automatic citizenship to 340,000 to 750,000 babies a year that are born to an illegal mother who sneaks into the United States.

And then the President has the temerity to go down to the border in El

Paso and make fun of people who think like I do, that say let's build a fence, a wall and a fence. He said some will want a moat, some will want alligators in it. He was standing down there within 220 yards of this, Mr. Speaker. This is El Paso, Texas. This is Juarez, Mexico. Some people would want a moat, some people would want a fence, some would want alligators in it—I don't think there are any alligators in here, Mr. Speaker. But this is the aerial picture that I had seen just a few weeks before the President gave this speech in El Paso. The records are good—not many people are getting across the border here. Why? Because we have—here's a fence right here, this is the Rio Grande River. We have a fence, a river, another fence—here is a patrol road that is patrolled by the Border Patrol. There is a Border Patrol vehicle right here, another one up around the curve—a patrol road, then another fence, then a canal that's forwarding a lot of water, and it flows pretty fast, then another fence. If you can get over that, you're in the United States, into El Paso, and maybe you can catch a ride here and you're home free.

Not a moat, not a moat with alligators; you might say two moats and four fences—a fence, the Rio Grande River, a fence, a patrol road, a fence, a canal with flowing water—and deep—another fence, and then you're off into the United States. Three of those fences you have to climb wet. This is very effective. And the President is standing within 220 yards of that making fun of Americans who think that physical structures help control illegal immigration.

So we're spending \$12 billion a year on this southern border, enforcing it and chasing people across the desert 100 miles into the United States. And out of that \$12 billion a year, that's \$6 million a mile, on average, for every mile on our southern border. I can build you a fence, a wall and a fence for about \$2 million a mile, about one-third of the annual budget. And I don't suggest that we build 2,000 miles of it right away, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that we start building it and stop building when they stop going around the end. That's the scenario, that's the logical way to address this. Build a fence, a wall and a fence; use the funding that we have, roll it into that kind of infrastructure. It is effective. And the President's staff didn't serve him very well if he was standing with his back to a fence, a river, a fence, a patrol road, another fence, a canal, and another fence. Those are the barriers to get into the United States, and he's making fun of it. And the Border Patrol is telling us this is effective. It is effective. It's been effective in El Paso, it keeps them in Juarez. It's been effective in San Luis in southwest Arizona. It's not effective where there is nothing. And we have to pay a lot of people a lot of time and money to chase all over the desert after people that walked around the end.

Let's build it until they stop going around the end. Let's pass the Birthright Citizenship Act of 2011. Let's make sure that the kind of security that is in El Paso can be applied in other high-traffic areas. Build a fence until they stop going around the end, and then, Mr. Speaker, we can also pass my New Idea Act, which shuts off the Federal deductibility for wages and benefits paid to illegals, brings the IRS into this mix, and gives the employer safe harbor. All of that. Simple solutions to a complex problem, Mr. Speaker.

I would conclude with that statement, thank you for your attention, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WALDEN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for July 11 on account of travel delays.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for July 11 on account of an unforeseen family medical emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 13, 2011, 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:

2393. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cloquintocet-mexyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0980; FRL-8877-2] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2394. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diethylene glycol mono butyl ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0474; FRL-8876-5] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2395. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propylene Oxide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0253; FRL-8877-7] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2396. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006", pursuant to Section 811A of the Native American Programs Act

of 1974; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2397. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana — Air Quality, Subchapter 7 and other Subchapters [EPA-R08-OAR-2006-0601; FRL-9223-4] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2398. 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; Illinois; Royal Fiberglass Pools, Inc. Adjusted Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0973; FRL-9319-2] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designations of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Alabama; Birmingham; Determination of Attaining Data for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0316-201139; FRL-9426-1] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2400. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCRA-2010-0307; FRL-9323-9] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0045; FRL-9317-8] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2402. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-15, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2403. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 7-11 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Kingdom of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2404. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Certification of the Fiscal Year 2011 Total Non-Dedicated Revised Local Source Revenues in Support of the District's \$181,330,000 General Obligation Bonds (Series 2010A)", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2405. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Atlanta, transmitting the 2010 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2406. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmit-

ting the Administration's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2407. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Newcastle, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0252; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-5] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2408. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Brunswick, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0116; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANE-1] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2409. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bozeman, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0249; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-6] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2410. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Cocoa, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0070; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASO-43] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2411. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Waynesboro, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1232; Airspace Docket No. 10-AEA-28] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2412. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Duluth, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0123; Airspace Docket No. 11-AGL-2] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2413. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Federal Airways; Alaska [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0010; Airspace Docket No. 11-AAL-1] received June 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2414. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting recommendations for the implementation of four projects by the Secretary of the Army; (H. Doc. No. 112-43); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

2415. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year [FY] 2010", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

2416. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2010 annual report on the operation of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.

2417. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the National Security Education Program (NSEP) for 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1906; jointly to the Committees on

Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Education and the Workforce.

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. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1062. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain additional disclosure requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1082. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 347. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2018) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to preserve the authority of each State to make determinations relating to the State's water quality standards, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-144). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on appropriations. First Semiannual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Appropriations for the 112th Congress (Rept. 112-145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mrs. BACHMANN):

H.R. 2496. A bill to specify that in the event that the debt ceiling is reached, the United States shall prioritize the payment of pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and the payment of obligations on the public debt, and to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a funding gap occurs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2497. A bill to suspend until January 21, 2013, certain provisions of Federal immigration law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. TSONGAS,

Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REYES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to encourage the nationwide observance of two minutes of silence each Veterans Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of lymphedema under the Medicare program and to reduce costs under such program related to the treatment of lymphedema; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FARR, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. CANSECO):

H.R. 2500. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the application of EHR payment incentives in cases of multi-campus hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2501. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of an individual's status or history of unemployment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 2503. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress posthumously to Father Mychal Judge, O.F.M., beloved Chaplain of the Fire Department of New York who passed away as the first recorded victim of the September 11, 2001, attacks in recognition of his example to the Nation of selfless dedication to duty and compassion for one's fellow citizens; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2504. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 2505. A bill to expand the research, prevention, and awareness activities of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health with respect to pulmonary fibrosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2506. A bill to establish the National Commission on Effective Marginal Tax Rates for Low-Income Families; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, 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. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 2507. A bill to exclude employees of the Transportation Security Administration from the collective bargaining rights of Federal employees and provide employment rights and an employee engagement mechanism for passenger and property screeners; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

89. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 111 memorializing the Congress to continue to support career and technical education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

90. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, relative to House Resolution No. 44 supporting the positive impact of the CSBG program in Iowa; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

91. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, rel-

ative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 163 memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to provide adequate funding for essential dredging activities on the Lower Mississippi River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

92. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 93 urging the Congress to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them by enacting the Social Security Fairness Act of 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

In addition, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13 states that Congress shall have power "To raise and support Armies" and "To provide and maintain a Navy."

Together, these provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds to ensure that U.S. service members will not lose pay due to a funding gap, as well as the power to prioritize the payment of debts.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution. Under this provision, Congress has the authority to regulate "commerce among the several states," "To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises," and "To make Rules for the Government."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2501.

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. HERGER:

H.R. 2502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

The Congress shall have the Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 2506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I, which grants Congress the 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. ROKITA:

H.R. 2507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 104: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 136: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 176: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 177: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 178: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 181: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 186: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 198: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 218: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 280: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 282: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 303: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 327: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 436: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 546: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 563: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 615: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BONNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 645: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 674: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. REBERG, Mr. WEST, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 687: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 719: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 743: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 745: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 791: Mr. REYES, Mr. OWENS, and Mr.

COURTNEY.

H.R. 798: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 849: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 870: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 894: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 904: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 923: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 931: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 997: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER,

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1093: Mr. MACK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. HEN-

SARLING.

H.R. 1113: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1161: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1175: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1195: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1206: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1219: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1259: Mr. YODER and Ms. ROS-

LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1297: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1340: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1364: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1386: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1417: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1426: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1466: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1475: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1515: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1558: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1581: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1588: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1591: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1633: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1663: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1703: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1738: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1744: Mr. REED, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WHIT-

FIELD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WEBSTER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1747: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1755: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1756: Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 1803: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1852: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1865: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1872: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1876: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1894: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1921: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1932: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1966: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1981: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1994: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2040: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 2068: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2069: Mr. WEST and Mr. RIVERA.

H.R. 2091: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2140: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2150: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2170: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2173: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2182: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 2198: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 2199: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2200: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2215: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2218: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2236: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONYERS, and

Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2250: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2255: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2257: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2299: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2304: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 2324: Mr. WOLF and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 2333: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2334: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2335: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 2348: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2358: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2371: Mr. LONG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska,

Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2375: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2401: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2402: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr.

BARLETTA, Mr. FRANTHOLD, Mr. ADERHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 2421: Mr. STARK and Ms. BROWN of

Florida.

H.R. 2433: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr.

MICA, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 2440: Mr. CONSECO.

H.R. 2443: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 2457: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 2463: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2492: Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. McDERMOTT,

Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas,

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ROTHAM of New Jersey, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 130: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 134: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 137: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 159: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 220: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 306: Mr. GRIMM and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Res. 317: Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 332: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII.

17. The SPEAKER presented a petition of The Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 281 urging the Federal Communications Commission to adopt and implement rules that would require mobile service providers to provide service usage alerts and information to customers; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2434

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any pay adjustment for Members of Congress under section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(2)).

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 62: Page 32, lines 4 and 23, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 63: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the activities specified in section 505 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13255).

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 64: Page 32, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 65: Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "increased by \$42,665,000)".

Page 33, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$42,665,000)".

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT NO. 66: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 327.13(a) of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. ROYCE

AMENDMENT NO. 67: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy for a methane hydrates program.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. ROYCE

AMENDMENT NO. 68: Page 28, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".