opportunity to do that, and we should do it. Millions of fellow Americans are counting on us to do this on an affirmative basis.

While we work toward an agreement to restore unemployment benefits, the Senate will also, as I mentioned earlier, consult the farm bill conference report. America’s farms and ranches are the most productive in the world. They support 16 million private sector jobs. Smart farm policies will help American farmers thrive. That is an important reason to move on our work to keep the economic recovery rolling. The farm bill will create jobs and cut taxpayer subsidies and save $23 billion which will be used to reduce the deficit.

I would also note that we have done an admirable job of reducing the debt. Do we need to do more? Of course we do. We have already reduced the debt during the Obama years by almost $3 trillion, and if we could get the Republicans in the House to agree on the bill we passed dealing with immigration reform, it would be another $1 trillion toward reducing the debt.

I would also note, as I indicated earlier, that when President Obama first took office, we were losing 700,000 jobs a month. We have now created more than 8 million jobs. We need to do more and the farm bill will help that. The farm bill will create jobs and cut taxpayer subsidies and save $20 billion which will be used to reduce the debt and deficit. The bill includes important reforms to farm programs, and while this measure doesn’t include as much funding for programs to reduce hunger as a number of us would like, it is a good compromise and it will protect needy families.

Senators STABENOW from Michigan has been the chairman of this committee. She has worked so hard for years to get this done. We have passed it twice here in the Senate. We have struggled to get something done in the House, and we were finally able to get this done under her leadership.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. BOOKER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1926, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1926) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 and to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Heller/Lee amendment No. 2700, to clarify that any private flood insurance policy accepted by a State shall satisfy the mandatory purchase requirement under the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.

Coburn/McCain amendment No. 2697, to allow States that opt out of participation in the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers. Toomey modified amendment No. 2707, to adjust phase-ins of flood insurance rate increases.

Merkley modified amendment No. 2709, to establish limitations on force-placed insurance.

SCHEDULE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:15 a.m. shall be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators MENENDEZ and TOOMEY or their designees controlling the final 10 minutes.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today in very strong support of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act and urge my colleagues to vote today to pass this legislation that will help millions of Americans across the country.

First, I want to recognize the admirable leadership of Senators MENENDEZ, ISAKSON, and LANDRIEU and wishing to put together such a strong coalition amidst some challenging political headwinds.

Senator LANDRIEU, in particular, has been like Paul Revere in the night for not only calling attention to the detrimental elements of the Biggert-Waters bill but for continuing to emphasize this bill’s importance to States from coast to coast.

Senator MENENDEZ and I share the New York-New Jersey coast, as does the Presiding Officer, and that, of course, has been devastated.

I will briefly say what has happened here. Literally tens of thousands of Americans will lose their homes—middle-class Americans who work hard, and poor Americans—if we don’t pass this legislation. Very simply, Biggert-Waters was not followed. Before increases were to go into effect, an affordability study was to be done. It was not. As a result, homeowners are having to pay thousands of dollars more. Homeowners who paid $500 a year for flood insurance—it is mandatory—now pay $4,000 or $5,000. There are some who pay as much as $30,000. Even worse, many more will lose their homes because the flood insurance for the next owner will go up so much they will lose tremendous value on their homes.

A home is the middle class’s piece of the rock. People struggle long and hard to pay that mortgage, and when they are in their later years, fifties, sixties, seventies—I guess fifties isn’t later years these days—this is what they have. Their nest egg is their home. To all of a sudden get walloped with huge flood insurance bills which they cannot pay, that is very difficult. And not required to buy flood insurance but want to do the prudent thing, may drop out of the program as well.

So, let me emphasize one point for my colleagues that may still have reservations about our bill: If folks start dropping out of the National Flood Insurance Program en masse, that would be a much larger drag on the system than a simple delay of rate increases.

Without flood insurance, when future disasters hit, these families and communities will be entirely dependent on Federal aid to help them rebuild. I fully support efforts to put the National Flood Insurance Program on a path to solvency, but it will not happen overnight, and attempting to do so in a manner that raises premiums too high too quickly, without consideration for broader affordability concerns, will end up being a decision that they come to regret.

We have to prevent the most devastating rate hikes from going into effect until FEMA and Congress can figure out a way to ensure the solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program without breaking the bank for middle-class homeowners.

It’s illogical for homeowners to pay higher premiums based on the risk zone of their home before FEMA accurately determines the actual risk. Yet, that is exactly what is happening today.

Currently, millions of policyholders who built to code and whose homes have been subsequently remapped into a higher risk area are facing significant rate increases with no assurance that the FEMA flood maps are accurate.

Prematurely forcing individuals and families out of their homes with astronomical increases of flood insurance premiums before even guaranteeing the reliability of rate numbers is unacceptable.

But the legislation before us today delays these rate increases until an overseer can certify that FEMA has implemented a flood mapping approach.
that utilizes sound scientific and engineering methodologies that accurately determine varying levels of flood risk.

Not a day goes by that I don’t think about the impact that Sandy had on the millions of families across New York. The damage and the struggles they face motivate me each day to do whatever I can to make their lives better.

As my colleagues can attest these are not isolated events. Storms are becoming more frequent and more intense. And they are not just in coastal New York, New Jersey and Louisiana, but Montana, Colorado and central States as well.

New Yorkers and families across the country aren’t thinking about whether the next natural disaster will impact them, they are thinking about when. This body can act now and prevent a manmade disaster from burdening anyone who has only just begun to recover, from potentially huge flood insurance premium hikes and loss of coverage, from the disastrous consequences of a law that was built to spread the word about a flood emergency and it does it with outrageous rate increases on homeowners, while it is happening all over the country; Senator AL FRANKEN from Minnesota, Senator Joe MANCHIN, Senator Bob CASEY from Pennsylvania, another Senator who has no ocean, but Pennsylvania has I think the most new FEMA maps of any State in the Union. The people of Pennsylvania would really be affected if our bill doesn’t pass. Even the amendments that is being offered by one of the Senators does not solve their problem and it is unfortunate, and I hope people will vote strongly against the Toomey amendment; Senator Kay HAGAN from North Carolina; of course, yours truly in the Chair, Senator CORY BOOKER, who came on early and was a huge supporter as soon as he got here. I think this was the first bill introduced and I couldn’t be more grateful, and I know the people of New Jersey are grateful for his leadership; Senator LINDSEY GRahAM of South Carolina, Senator Brian SCHATZ of Hawaii, Senator RichARd BIAIRN from Montana, Senator MenENDEz of New Jersey, Senator Franken from Minnesota, Senator Joe MANCHIN, Senator REID who recognizes he has a flooding problem as well and that this is not just a coastal issue. He is our leader on the Democratic side, and we would not be where we are today without his leadership.

We would not be where we are today without the commitment of Senator HARRY REID who recognizes he has a flooding problem as well and that this is not just a coastal issue. He stood up early to tell us that if we could build a strong coalition, if we could build 60 plus votes, he would help us get to a point where we could actually have a debate on amendments, vote them up or down, and then move this bill, with the strongest vote possible, to the House of Representatives, where I am sure there are sponsors of this bill; Senator Bill NELSON of Florida, Senator RUBIO of Florida—and particularly Senator Nelson who got on this bill early and began educating people not only in Florida but around the country. Senator ALFORD from South Carolina, Senator HEIDI MARKEY from Massachusetts, as well as ELLIZABETH Warren from Massachusetts. Senators were early supporters of this bill; Senator Bill NUNN of Florida, Senator RUBIO of Florida—and particularly Senator NELSON who got on this bill early and began educating people not only in Florida but around the country. Senator ALFORD from South Carolina, Senator HEIDI MARKEY from Massachusetts, as well as ELLIZABETH Warren from Massachusetts. Senators were early supporters of this bill; Senator Bill NUNN of Florida, Senator RUBIO of Florida—and particularly Senator NELSON who got on this bill early and began educating people not only in Florida but around the country. Senator ALFORD from South Carolina, Senator HEIDI MARKEY from Massachusetts, as well as ELLIZABETH Warren from Massachusetts. Senators were early supporters of this bill; Senator Bill NUNN of Florida, Senator RUBIO of Florida—and particularly Senator NELSON who got on this bill early and began educating people not only in Florida but around the country.
Senator SCHUMER said, to stay in their homes and not lose all the equity they have literally worked for not only their entire lives but potentially for two generations of work which has gone into building equity—sometimes three. Generations have gone into building equity in homes—just for a misguided piece of legislation to swipe away from them, in the blink of an eye, their homes’ value.

So I hope people will vote strongly against the Toomey amendment. A vote for the Toomey amendment will signal a vote against our efforts for reform. He will say his efforts are to reform, that it will only allow raises of 25 percent a year. There is no cap on his bill. There are no requirements for an affordability study. There are no requirements for accurate FEMA mapping. His bill is a red herring and a distraction from what we are trying to do.

Senator JOHNS from the republican side deserves so much credit for organizing his team.

I also recognize the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for his help in getting us to this point, and I thank him.

I also want to thank a very important group which is GNO, Inc.—Greater New Orleans, Inc.—which is a 16-parish economic coalition in our State, made up of parish presidents and elected officials and university presidents, that really focuses on the economic vitality of our region. Michael Hetch is the executive director—an extremely talented young leader. They recognized immediately to their attention the problems with Biggert-Waters, the disaster it would be to the 16 parishes they represent. Not only did they step up and help us organize all of our 16 parishes, but they began immediately to reach out to New Jersey and to New York and to Pennsylvania and to California and to Oregon—to reach out to the bankers and the realtors.

That began an extraordinary development of a very strong coalition. I thank them for their leadership.

I thank the National Association of Realtors and the National Homebuilders Association, NACo. The president of NACo—the National Association of Counties—was in my office on several occasions working very hard with elected officials all over the country to raise the flag about this issue and to say it is time to take a pause on Biggert-Waters—not a complete repeal; not moving back on our reforms, but to take a step toward that today.

It is important to get this right. There are too many homes that will be lost, too many families impacted, too many businesses hurt, too many for-sale signs and too many real estate agents being put out of business, too many for-sale signs coming down, too many people making decisions because they have lost equity in their home. It is time to fix this problem now, and we can.

I thank Senator MERKLEY, who will be the subcommittee chair as this sort of new reform is written. And finally, I thank Senator MENENDEZ and Senator ISAKSON for their extraordinary knowledge of this subject, their leadership, and helping us get to the point where we are.

I do not see any other colleagues on the floor. When I do, I will yield the floor. I understand Senator TOOMEY and Senator MENENDEZ are going to come to close out this debate. But I do want to say again that the Biggert-Waters bill was built backwards and built wrong. We have immediate rate increases on responsible homeowners without any understanding of how it would impact their individual policies.

I want to also say this, Mr. President—and I think you have heard me speak about this both publicly and we have talked privately—the people in Louisiana who have been the victims and survivors of massive hurricanes and storms and levee breaks are well aware that it will actually underwrite it as a reality. We are building our levees as fast as we can, with very little help over time. Now, after emergencies, the Federal Government comes in with a lot of money, but year in and year out we are having a very hard time getting any infrastructure built from the Corps of Engineers budget, which is woefully underfunded for the whole country. And the President’s Office knows that because his communities suffer as well.

We are building our levees as fast as we can with a lot of our own money and a lot of our own tax dollars. We are raising our homes as fast as we can, elevating them. We are putting in new zoning, and people are very mindful of not developing low-lying areas. But we have to have policies that are well thought out and well balanced to accommodate communities that have literally been here for 300 years.

In celebrating its 300th birthday in just a few years from now, this is not about a group of people who went down there 20 years ago for Sun and for vacation. This is about people who came 300 years ago to secure the mouth of the greatest river system in North America and one of the greatest river systems in the world.

This is not fun and games. This is work and empowerment and wealth building and opportunity that the President talked about the other day. That is what this bill is about.

We need to start with building a flood program, partnered with the private sector, that works for average, middle-class families. We do not have to do that. We are going to get the first step toward that today.

I see my colleagues on the floor, so I am going to yield the floor. I know the time has been set aside. When we vote on the Toomey amendment, please vote strongly against. When we vote on final passage, please vote a strong yes. There are a few other amendments Senators ISAKSON and MENENDEZ will speak to more directly, as we wrap up this debate today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, it is good to see my colleague from New Jersey presiding.

I rise in support of this legislation we are about to consider, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, which, again, is unique insofar as it is a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation to ensure families are able to afford flood insurance so they can stay in their homes, so that businesses can stay open, and property values will not plummet.

AMENDMENT NO. 2707

I also rise in opposition to the Toomey substitute amendment, which would completely undermine our bill and perpetuate a failed policy. While we support putting the National Flood Insurance Program on a path to solvency, current law hikes rates so fast and so high that it will actually undermine the solvency of the program. These drastic increases will act as a de facto eviction notice for homeowners who have lived in their homes and played by the rules their entire lives. That is going to drive down property values, as the housing market is struggling to recover.

What is most alarming is the fact that FEMA does not even know the size or scope of this problem. They were supposed to complete a study on the affordability of rate increases mandated by Biggert-Waters by last April, but they failed to do so. That is simply unacceptable.
While there is no question we need to put the flood insurance program on a more solvent trajectory, we first need to understand the impact these dramatic changes in Biggert-Waters will have on the housing market and be sure processes time they use to set these rates is accurate.

That is why our bill would impose a moratorium on the phaseout of subsidies and grandfathered in Biggert-Waters for most primary residences. It would complete the affordability study that was mandated in Biggert-Waters and proposes a regulatory framework to address the issues found in the study.

Whether FEMA does or that in 6 months, 1 year—whatever periods of time—as soon as they do that and propose that regulatory framework, we are ready to go. So those who say this is somehow an inordinate amount of time, that is going to cost the homeowner a FEMA’s promptness in getting the affordability study that was supposed to have been done under law by last April.

It would also require FEMA to certify in writing that it has implemented a floor approach that utilizes sound scientific and engineering methodologies before certain rate reforms are implemented.

The reason that is important is because for example, we saw in New Jersey where FEMA maps were put out, and we ultimately heard a hue and cry from communities and counties across the State that said: Look, that can’t be right. We have had properties that have never flooded. Even in Sandy they did not have virtually any flooding, and now they are in the zone, and particularly in the most difficult zones, called V zones, where the consequence of being in a V zone may very well be whopper you have to keep your house. When we challenged and brought municipal and county engineers to bear, what did we find? In some counties we had an 80-percent reduction. Had we not challenged those maps, where would we be today? So we want the basis of these maps to be scientific, using engineering methodologies that are sound.

Also, this new legislation would reimburse qualifying homeowners for successful appeals of erroneous flood map determinations. If we are going to say these maps are somehow sacrosanct, and you go and challenge them, and find out they were wrong, you should be able to not have to bear that burden.

It would give communities fair credit for locally funded flood protection systems. It would continue the fair treatment afforded to communities with flood damage exemptions. It would provide for a FEMA ombudsman to advocate for and provide information to policyholders. It would streamline the registration process for insurance brokers and agents so they can provide better timely services to policyholders during a disaster.

Just as important as what this bill does is what it will not do. The legislation would not stop the phaseout of taxpayer-funded subsidies for vacation homes and homes that have been substantially damaged. It would not stop the phaseout of taxpayer-funded subsidies for properties that have been repetitively flooded. Including these properties would put risks that account for over a third of all claims. It would not encourage new construction in environmentally sensitive or flood-prone areas. And it would not stop most of the important reforms included in Biggert-Waters.

This legislation reaches a delicate balance that recognizes the need to improve solvency and phase out certain subsidies but tries to do so without discouraging program participation.

Finally, Senator TOOMEY acknowledges that Biggert-Waters, I think, is totally flawed and must be changed, but basically his amendment falls far short of what all of us who have come together in support will do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly my amendment and the underlying bill. But first I want to thank my colleagues COATS, MCCONNELL, COBURN, HATCH, KIRK, and JOHNS—and I want to thank the bipartisan coalition of Senators who are supporting my approach.

There is a problem with our flood insurance program as a result of the reforms, and it needs to be addressed. The problem is that, in the process of reforming this program so it would actually become sustainable—so that it actually could become solvent—in the process of making those changes, some people’s premiums go up very dramatically and pretty suddenly. The phase-in is very quick and the increase is very high. That is a huge problem, and it needs to be addressed.

The Menendez bill addresses it the wrong way. What this bill does is it does kill the meaningful reform. It completely suspends for 4 years. There is no adjustment of premiums toward an actuarially sound market-based level of premiums that do not require taxpayer subsidy. So we will be going back—oh, it busts the budget, by the way—we will be going back to a system where literally Warren Buffett can buy a home, and as long as he makes it his primary residence, he can continue to have taxpayers subsidize his cost of flood insurance. I just do not know how that is even remotely defensible. But that is what we would be heading back to if we adopt the Menendez bill.

In addition, by throwing out the reform, by throwing out the movement toward an actuarially sound system, we go right back to the insolvent, unsustainable program we had before, which means the NFIP, under the Menendez bill, will that much sooner reach the fact that you have a solvent system. We cover that as well.

Finally, the administration supports this approach. In the very same Statement of Administration Policy, President Obama’s administration stated this:

The Administration strongly supports a phased transition to actuarially sound flood insurance rates.

The Menendez bill absolutely does not do this. My amendment absolutely does because this is what makes sense. This is how we soften the blow. We create a reasonable transition and we maintain a fiscally sound, actuarially sound program that does not bust the
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 65, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 2707), as modified, was rejected. Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

An opt-out protecting 10th Amendment privileges of the State is highly required to make sure we do not go outside the bounds of our legal obligations. I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have been here before. Fifteen years ago, Gramm-Leach-Billey offered what the good Senator from Oklahoma is offering, and it is why NARAB has never been successful. What this does is it empowers our State regulators, and that is why they support this bill. Notice you haven’t heard a lot from States about taking away their rights here because it does not. It empowers them, it brings more competition in the marketplace, and it helps consumers. This is good. I kick it over to my cosponsor and the good Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I thank my cosponsor Senator TESTER, and he is 1,000 percent right. We have been down this road. We have worked so hard to get everybody on board. States are on board. It does empower States. It does allow them to do what they need to do. I urge my colleagues to be a “no” vote on the Coburn amendment.

An opt-out protecting 10th Amendment privileges of the State is highly required to make sure we do not go outside the bounds of our legal obligations. I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have been here before. Fifteen years ago, Gramm-Leach-Billey offered what the good Senator from Oklahoma is offering, and it is why NARAB has never been successful. What this does is it empowers our State regulators, and that is why they support this bill. Notice you haven’t heard a lot from States about taking away their rights here because it does not. It empowers them, it brings more competition in the marketplace, and it helps consumers. This is good. I kick it over to my cosponsor and the good Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, if this is true, with no opt-out, then why not do it for lawyers? Why not do it for doctors? Why not do it for every other thing that is licensed that would be better for consumers? Not to give an opt-out is not right to the individual States.

I support the bill; I just think we need to have a protection for the States. And the reason there is opposition to this is because there is obviously some people who don’t agree that everybody is on board. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 75, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An opt-out protecting 10th Amendment privileges of the State is highly required to make sure we do not go outside the bounds of our legal obligations. I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have been here before. Fifteen years ago, Gramm-Leach-Billey offered what the good Senator from Oklahoma is offering, and it is why NARAB has never been successful. What this does is it empowers our State regulators, and that is why they support this bill. Notice you haven’t heard a lot from States about taking away their rights here because it does not. It empowers them, it brings more competition in the marketplace, and it helps consumers. This is good. I kick it over to my cosponsor and the good Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I thank my cosponsor Senator TESTER, and he is 1,000 percent right. We have been down this road. We have worked so hard to get everybody on board. States are on board. It does empower States. It does allow them to do what they need to do. I urge my colleagues to be a “no” vote on the Coburn amendment.

An opt-out protecting 10th Amendment privileges of the State is highly required to make sure we do not go outside the bounds of our legal obligations. I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have been here before. Fifteen years ago, Gramm-Leach-Billey offered what the good Senator from Oklahoma is offering, and it is why NARAB has never been successful. What this does is it empowers our State regulators, and that is why they support this bill. Notice you haven’t heard a lot from States about taking away their rights here because it does not. It empowers them, it brings more competition in the marketplace, and it helps consumers. This is good. I kick it over to my cosponsor and the good Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, if this is true, with no opt-out, then why not do it for lawyers? Why not do it for doctors? Why not do it for every other thing that is licensed that would be better for consumers? Not to give an opt-out is not right to the individual States.

I support the bill; I just think we need to have a protection for the States. And the reason there is opposition to this is because there is obviously some people who don’t agree that everybody is on board. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 75, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An opt-out protecting 10th Amendment privileges of the State is highly required to make sure we do not go outside the bounds of our legal obligations. I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have been here before. Fifteen years ago, Gramm-Leach-Billey offered what the good Senator from Oklahoma is offering, and it is why NARAB has never been successful. What this does is it empowers our State regulators, and that is why they support this bill. Notice you haven’t heard a lot from States about taking away their rights here because it does not. It empowers them, it brings more competition in the marketplace, and it helps consumers. This is good. I kick it over to my cosponsor and the good Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I thank my cosponsor Senator TESTER, and he is 1,000 percent right. We have been down this road. We have worked so hard to get everybody on board. States are on board. It does empower States. It does allow them to do what they need to do. I urge my colleagues to be a “no” vote on the Coburn amendment.

An opt-out protecting 10th Amendment privileges of the State is highly required to make sure we do not go outside the bounds of our legal obligations. I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have been here before. Fifteen years ago, Gramm-Leach-Billey offered what the good Senator from Oklahoma is offering, and it is why NARAB has never been successful. What this does is it empowers our State regulators, and that is why they support this bill. Notice you haven’t heard a lot from States about taking away their rights here because it does not. It empowers them, it brings more competition in the marketplace, and it helps consumers. This is good. I kick it over to my cosponsor and the good Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, if this is true, with no opt-out, then why not do it for lawyers? Why not do it for doctors? Why not do it for every other thing that is licensed that would be better for consumers? Not to give an opt-out is not right to the individual States.

I support the bill; I just think we need to have a protection for the States. And the reason there is opposition to this is because there is obviously some people who don’t agree that everybody is on board. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 75, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
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by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. HELLER.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, let me be clear that my amendment simply clarifies existing law. I am trying to provide some clarity that private flood insurance can be a viable option for homeowners and businesses. Private insurers are already subject to regulations in each and every State by their insurance commissioners, and those insurance commissioners are the best regulators for ensuring proper consumer protection.

So I ask my colleagues to support the Heller-Lee amendment so we can provide the American people with more competition, higher quality, and less cost when it comes to flood insurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I have to oppose the Heller amendment. This amendment would weaken consumer protections and completely remove minimum standards with respect to private flood insurance policies. In particular, the amendment strips the requirement that the private policy has to be comparable to a national flood insurance policy, meaning that companies would be able to offer inadequate policies across the country without any requirements as to what is in the policy. For all of those who have talked about solvency, if you have insurance that doesn’t meet a minimum standard to ensure that the consequences of flooding can be paid for by the policy, you want to vote against this amendment.

I urge a “no” vote on the Heller amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 18 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander  
Ayotte  
Barrasso  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Burr  
Chambliss  
Coats  
Cochran  
Corker  
Crapo  
Cruz

Kirk  
Leahy  
Flake  
Graham  
Hagan  
Hatch  
Heller  
McCain  
Mccain  
Johnson (WI)

NAYS—50

Baldwin  
Baucus  
Begich  
Bennet  
Bennett  
Boehm  
Boxer  
Casey  
Coons  
Corker  
Franken  
Gillibrand  
Grassley  
Heller-Lee amendment so we can provide the American people with more competition, higher quality, and less cost when it comes to flood insurance.

Today’s bill will fix many of these problems by allowing the use of private flood insurance policies in the event of a flood. It will also provide for a national flood insurance program that will be run by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and will be funded by a surcharge on all flood insurance policies. This program will provide a safety net for those who cannot afford private flood insurance.

The amendment (No. 2700) was rejected.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I support S. 1926, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2013. The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act improved many aspects of the National Flood Insurance Program, it also resulted in a dire situation for a number of American families who suddenly found that their insurance rates would be doubled, tripled, or more. And it locked some families into homes they couldn’t afford to insure but also couldn’t afford to sell.

Today’s bill will fix many of these problems by allowing the use of private flood insurance policies in the event of a flood. It will also provide for a national flood insurance program that will be run by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and will be funded by a surcharge on all flood insurance policies. This program will provide a safety net for those who cannot afford private flood insurance.

Today’s bill will fix many of these problems by allowing the use of private flood insurance policies in the event of a flood. It will also provide for a national flood insurance program that will be run by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and will be funded by a surcharge on all flood insurance policies. This program will provide a safety net for those who cannot afford private flood insurance.

Today’s bill will fix many of these problems by allowing the use of private flood insurance policies in the event of a flood. It will also provide for a national flood insurance program that will be run by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and will be funded by a surcharge on all flood insurance policies. This program will provide a safety net for those who cannot afford private flood insurance.

Today’s bill will fix many of these problems by allowing the use of private flood insurance policies in the event of a flood. It will also provide for a national flood insurance program that will be run by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and will be funded by a surcharge on all flood insurance policies. This program will provide a safety net for those who cannot afford private flood insurance.
me that will be made part of the record.
Again, the bill before us provides some relief for homeowners facing huge rate increases, while preserving rate decreases for homeowners that are currently eligible for them, and I am therefore supportive of this bill.

RECESS
Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 1:50 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:50 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 1:50 p.m. and reassembled for other purposes by the Presiding Officer (Ms. HIRONO).

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of all conferences on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding with the conference report?

Without objection, the Senate will proceed.

(The conference report is printed in the House Proceedings of the Record of Monday, January 27, 2014.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion that I ask be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2642, the Federal Agricultural Reform and Risk Management Act.

Harry Reid, Debbie Stabenow, Robert Menendez, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Tammy Baldwin, Jon Tester, Michael F. Bennet, Patrick J. Leahy, Max Baucus, Amy Klobuchar, Heidi Heitkamp, Joe Donnelly, Richard J. Durbin, Mark Udall, Martin Heinrich, Sherrod Brown.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandate of a quorum under rule XXXII be waived; that the cloture vote on the agreement of the two Houses to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) be taken at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 3, that if cloture is invoked, there be 20 minutes remaining postcloture at 2:15 p.m., Tuesday, February 4, to be equally divided between the two leaders or their designates; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014—Continued

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that we resume consideration of S. 1926.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of S. 1926. Who yields time?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I will be brief in just to express my thanks to Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, as well as Senator LANDRIEU and Senator VITTER and all of those who came together to put together a great bill for the people of the United States of America for Federal flood insurance. It was a team effort, a bipartisan effort, an equally divided effort between Republicans and Democrats.

I urge everybody to vote for the bill, and I again thank the Senator from New Jersey for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I urge all of our colleagues to cast a ‘yes’ vote on the final passage of the homeowner flood insurance act.

I think this has been an excellent week for the Senate. We were able to break through what sometimes is partisan gridlock and far too often perverted this auspicious Chamber. We have had an honest and open debate on this issue that is critical to the American people. We have had a respectable debate on good-faith amendments that were germane to the bill and lived up to the ideals of the Senate, and now we are poised to pass a critical piece of legislation which I believe enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support which will provide real relief to millions of American families.

I thank all of our cosponsors and their staffs, including a very large list of Republicans who support the bill. I particularly thank my lead Republican cosponsor, Senator ISAKSON, for his efforts and the partnership on this issue and many others. I have had the pleasure to work with Senator ISAKSON on a number of issues and have come to respect his honesty and his desire to come together and get things done, regardless of the issue. I think he is one of the most well-respected Members of the Senate. Together, working with our colleagues, I think we are poised to give some real relief to families and to send a strong message to the House and hope they will follow suit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Yeas 67—Nays 32]

The bill (S. 1926), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 1926

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