promote, support, and approve private space missions.

Mr. Speaker, there is much work left to be done to bolster American competitiveness and foster innovation, and I hope Congress will act next year to continue our leadership in space.

With this hope and expectation, I support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of S. 3277, the Space Frontier Act of 2019.

I say ''reluctant'' because the process that brought us to this point is extremely disappointing. Many of the provisions of this bill have not been seriously vetted by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. I doubt very much whether they were at all vetted by anyone in the Senate. And this bill makes some potentially significant changes to space policy in the United States.

□ 1145

This is no way to legislate.

However, there are some good things in the bill. I very much appreciate that the end date for the International Space Station is pushed back to 2030. Now, I don't know if that date is the proper one, but I do know that the arbitrary decision made by the Trump administration to end the International Space Station by 2024 was wrong. As we move into the next Congress, this is something that I hope to be looking into.

I am also glad to see commercial remote sensing language that will help the industry grow, while still considering the government's legitimate security interests.

In short, I will be voting for this bill, in part, because I support the development of commercial space activities and want them to flourish, while still protecting the public interest.

However, as the presumptive chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee in the next Congress, I certainly will be revisiting some of the other items in the bill. For instance, this bill creates a $150 million office at NASA and doesn't specify where the money is to come from within NASA, or provide any real specifics to how it will be spent.

I would also note that NASA's vital education programs receive less money than that, so this is a major new initiative and it is something that requires review.

I could go on, but, unfortunately, it is clear that there is not going to be time today for a thoughtful discussion of any concerns with the bill or any opportunity to address them. That will have to wait until we have a new Congress.

I plan to submit a longer statement in the RECORD which will highlight some of my concerns. For now, it is enough to say that I support NASA's mission and a robust U.S. space industry and, for that reason, I support this bill, in spite of the awful process that got us here.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have no other requests for time on this side, so I am prepared to yield back if the gentlewoman from Texas is prepared to yield back.

Before I do, I just want to thank the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, who is, obviously, a Texas colleague and a longtime friend, for all of her good work on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee while I have been chairman of that committee. She has been instrumental in our taking to the House floor and having passed on the House floor 35 bills. Of those 35 bills, 33 have been bipartisan, and that is largely due to her contributions and her efforts to try to make those bills bipartisan.

So I do appreciate having worked with her for the last 6 years. I wish her well next year, and I want to congratulate her on being the next chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. But I would like to say, on behalf of my retiring chair, that it has been a challenge. I have learned a lot. I respect and like him. I wish him well for his future, and I hope that he will visit us now and then to see that we will have a little bit of a change in the committee.

I hope that we will pass this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3277.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM COMPETITION AND EXTENSION ACT OF 2018

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7388) to extend the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7388

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Flood Insurance Program Competition and Extension Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINANCING.—Section 1309(a) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)) is amended by striking ''December 7, 2018'' and inserting ''May 31, 2019''.

(b) PROGRAM EXPIRATION.—Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4026) is amended by striking ''December 7, 2018'' and inserting ''May 31, 2019''.

(c) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—If this Act is enacted after December 21, 2018, the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect as if enacted on December 21, 2018.

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF NON-COMPETE REQUIREMENT.

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:

''(f) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE OTHER FLOOD COVERAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may not, as a condition of participating in the Write Your Own Program (as such term is defined in section 100202(a) of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 4004(a))) or in otherwise participating in the utilization by the Administrator of the facilities and services of insurance companies, insurers, insurance agents and brokers, and insurance adjustment organizations pursuant to the authority in this section, nor as a condition of eligibility to engage in any other activities under the National Flood Insurance Program under this title, restrict any such company, insurer, agent, broker, or organization from offering and selling private flood insurance (as such term is defined in section 102(b) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(b)).

''(2) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE; SUBSIDY ARRANGEMENT.—After the date of the enactment of this subsection—

''(A) the Administrator may not include in any agreement entered into with any insurer for participation in the Write Your Own Program any provision establishing a condition prohibited by paragraph (1), including the provisions of Article XIII of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration, Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement, as adopted pursuant to section 62.23(a) of title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations; and

''(B) any such provision in any such agreement entered into before such date of enactment shall not have any force or effect, and the Administrator may not take any action to enforce such provision.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the National Flood Insurance Program is a program that has a number of challenges, but it is also a vital program for Americans who live in flood-prone areas.

The challenges in the program are well-known. Regrettably, it is going bankrupt. Regrettably, it incents people to live in areas that are repeatedly flooded. Regrettably, it is a program that protects a government monopoly; that is why the House, earlier this year, acted with a comprehensive reform bill. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the Capitol have yet to act.

We do not wish to have the current program lapse; thus, we are on the floor at this very moment.

This is a very simple bill. It would provide a temporary, short-term authorization through the end of May of 2019, regrettably, I believe now, the ninth extension since the House has acted.

And it also ensures that we provide certainty, certainty to the market of what the policies of the National Flood Insurance Program are.

I was there in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey. And one of the great tragedies—there were many tragedies, but one of the great tragedies was how few people actually had flood insurance. So what we want is a system that, hopefully, will see more people have flood coverage written into their homeowners' insurance policy.

So the NFIP wisely had moved in the direction of what they call allowing insurance companies to not have to have a non-compete. This is a current policy of the program, but too many insurance companies don't believe that policy will stay. So we will ensure that that policy stays through this bill, so that more people in a tragic situation will be covered by flood insurance.

So, again, this ensures that current policy is at least extended through May of 2019. It adds certainty to current policy.

I know in discussions with the ranking member—who has a lot of expertise in the subject of flood—we negotiated in good faith. We didn't quite get there on the comprehensive bill, but she agrees that we need this bill, right now, to ensure that current policy is extended, at least through May of 2019.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to try and explain exactly what is happening with this proposal by my chairman, Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. HENSARLING came to me and indicated that he wanted to add language to the reauthorization, the short-term reauthorization of the flood insurance program.

I explained to him that I had an agreement with Mr. SCALISE, and our agreement was that this would be a short-term reauthorization that was clean; that it would be added to the continuing resolution; and that we would see to it that the flood insurance program would not lapse.

So Mr. HENSARLING went to Mr. SCALISE and Mr. SCALISE agreed to it and, because he agreed to it, Mr. HENSARLING moved forward.

Following that, staff members pointed out that if the language is added that Mr. HENSARLING would like to add, it was going to create a problem. It was going to create a confrontation; that we would endanger the ability to have short-term reauthorization and, if we do that, homeowners are going to be disadvantaged because they would not have access to the insurance that they need to satisfy the mortgages that they were trying to get.

So we have had a long discussion and a long debate about what the Senate is going to do and, of course, our understanding now is that the Senate will not support the language that is going to be put in that is headed by Mr. HENSARLING; and this was going to endanger the ability for us to get the short-term reauthorization.

So, given all of that, and understanding all of that, yes, I made an agreement with Mr. HENSARLING that, if Mr. SCALISE agreed, that I would agree, but I want—and I have said to Mr. HENSARLING, as we had a long discussion on the floor with some of the leadership, et cetera, that one of the things we want is, we want this short-term reauthorization until May, until we can get to work on long-term reauthorization for the National Flood Insurance Program.

Yes, Mr. HENSARLING is correct that we do have the possibility now for private insurers who write insurance for the national flood insurance, to do both, to be able to write insurance. But we do know that even if they are able to do it now, we are not saying that we should do anything to codify that in existing law. They are saying you should not do anything to codify that in existing law, simply because it endangers the ability for the support for the National Flood Insurance Program to be reauthorized through the short-term.

So it is complicated and it presents a dilemma for everybody. But in the final analysis, no matter what, the real question becomes: Is it important for a short-term reauthorization of the national flood insurance; or do we allow it to get caught up in these agreements so that we don't have it, and then the real estate market is going to go crazy; homeowners who are trying to purchase insurance, because they can't get a mortgage without it, all of this will be absolutely undermined. And that is the essence of what is going on.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out again, all this bill does is extend for 6 months the current policies of the NFIP. Not one single policy of the NFIP is changed in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to talk about this important program.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her consistent commitment to making sure that the National Flood Insurance Program is there for families who need it, families all around the country, not just families, by the way, Mr. Speaker, in coastal areas. This is a program that affects every community in our country. It is a program that affects millions of people throughout the country, hundreds of thousands in my home State of Louisiana, but people from all around. It is an important program.

Mr. Speaker, I would love for this to be a private program, where there were great options all around for people to buy private flood insurance. Unfortunately, today there aren't; and so because there aren't those private options, the only game in town is NFIP. So it is incumbent upon us to make sure that this program works. And it has got to be a program that is fair for ratepayers and fair for taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, we have had many different long-term and short-term reauthorizations. It is well-documented. It has been one of the frustrations of trying to get consistency in the program, but, in the meantime, it is important that this program move forward.

Too many people are counting on NFIP to be there for them that have a closing on a home this week; maybe somebody's buying a new house for Christmas and they have to have flood insurance. We need to make sure that that program is there for them.

So it is important that we continue to keep this going, while negotiations will go on to see if we can get a long-term solution. The House came together and figured out a way to get a 5-year reauthorization, but the Senate wasn't able to put it together. I have no doubt in the future we are going to have those negotiations and find a way to get a long-term reauthorization for the program. I appreciate all the efforts that are being made.

But, in the meantime, people know that you can't just have this program expire as those negotiations go on.

So, with that said, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the parties involved who are negotiating in good faith to try to get this done.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her continued efforts to make sure that people, millions of people all across this country have that program.

I want to thank the chairman for his years of service. It has been a long time. We have worked together, both former chairmen of the RSC, and I know he is going to have brighter days ahead. I am sure he is glad that he will have a few more days to live out his current career, but I appreciate the gentleman from Texas' service over these years to our country in Congress.

□ 1200

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that what Mr. SCALISE said is the significant question about this issue, and that is: What do we do today to make sure that we have short-term reauthorization?

If we have thoughts other than that, are we reexamining those thoughts in any way, or do we understand the danger that may be imposed upon our ability to get short-term reauthorization with any efforts that we are making to codify or place into law the ability for private insurers to participate in the program, along with the way that they participate for the National Flood Insurance Program?

I think the significant question is what Mr. SCALISE has said: Will we be able to support short-term reauthorization with whatever we do today? That becomes the question.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority whip for his kind words and our ability to work together to put together a product that we are both proud of and that the House passed. Again, we regret that those on the other side of the Capitol have not seen the wisdom to put forth any plan.

What we have before us is something that is quite simple. If you believe that you want to create at least 6 months of certainty for the market, for the real estate market, residential market, particularly in flood-prone areas, then you will pass this bill, because this is the one that creates certainty that every single current policy of the NFIP is extended for 6 months. That is what it does.

It codifies one particular policy of the NFIP, and this creates more certainty. This is what people have come to the floor to say they want.

Again, I lament the fact we are not doing a 5-year reauthorization. I lament the fact we are not dealing with many of the challenges that I mentioned earlier, but at least, today, we can create certainty for 6 months as negotiations continue in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this last-ditch effort to attach harmful policy riders to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) reauthorization. While H.R. 7388 reauthorizes the NFIP through May 31, 2019, House Republicans have attached controversial policy reforms that have been rejected several times by the House and Senate to a bill that would keep the NFIP's doors open. This harmful policy change was recently implemented administratively by the Trump administration.

This policy reverses the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) "Write Your Own" non-compete clause and would allow private insurance companies partnering with and servicing NFIP policies to sell their own competing private policies to unsuspecting consumers. We should not allow private insurers to cherry-pick the best risk policies for their own private businesses and force taxpayers to pick up the rest.

The Senate has already unanimously passed a clean extension that does not include this toxic rider. The House should ensure that flood insurance remains available to millions of homeowners, businesses, and renters across the country that rely on it and pass a clean extension.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7388.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1536

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 21, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 21, 2018, at 12:26 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2432.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1660.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3460.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 6287.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

9/11 MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 6287) to provide competitive grants for the operation, security, and maintenance of certain memorials to victims of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike '', the Pentagon, and United Airlines Flight 93'' and insert ''*and the Pentagon*''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6287, sponsored by Congressman TOM MACARTHUR, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to award grants through a competitive process to nonprofit organizations to operate, provide security, maintain, and increase visitation at U.S. memorials to the victims of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. This bill passed the House by voice vote on September 12.

Throughout our Nation's history, Congress has supported public-private partnerships with nongovernmental organizations for the operation and maintenance of memorials and museums of national significance. Such partnerships exist at the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, for example.

The Senate has amended the bill to remove the Flight 93 site in Pennsylvania from the program at the supporting foundation's request.

This bill will ensure that our Nation's other 9/11 memorials are maintained and preserved for future generations to visit, learn, and reflect. May we never forget the nearly 3,000 Americans we lost that fateful day.