to the watchdogs who want to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in our government.

So this is not a controversial bill because it has taken years of hard work to get it right. But, in fact, this is a major piece of legislation.

I want to close by thanking Senator CARPER, Senator COBURN, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator WARNER, the author of the bill today, in addition to Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and of course, my ranking member, Congressman CUMMINGS.

This has been bipartisan. It is one of the many pieces of bipartisan legislation that take a long time, they hold a lot of hearings, but at the end of the day, the American people can trust that the American people's work does get done, in spite of some of the things we are unable to do. This is a major piece of legislation.

I want to thank, lastly, leadership for bringing this to the floor today in a timely fashion so that we can get it to the President's desk for signing next week.

Madam Speaker, I urge support and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 994.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF RULES APPLYING TO HUMAN OCCUPANCY OF PENTHOUSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDINGS

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4192) to amend the Act entitled ''An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia'' to clarify the rules of the District of Columbia regarding human occupancy of penthouses above the top story of the building upon which the penthouse is placed, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4192

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF RULES APPLYING TO HUMAN OCCUPANCY OF PENTHOUSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDINGS.

(a) PERMITTING HUMAN OCCUPANCY OF PENTHOUSES WITHIN CERTAIN HEIGHT LIMIT.—The eighth paragraph of section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia'', approved June 1, 1910 (sec. 6–601.05(h), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking ''penthouses over elevator shafts,'' and inserting ''penthouses,''; and

(2) by striking ''and no floor or compartment thereof shall be constructed or used for human occupancy above the top story of the building upon which such structures are placed'' and inserting ''and, except in the case of a penthouse which is erected to a height of one story of 20 feet or less above the level of the roof, no floor or compartment thereof shall be constructed or used for human occupancy above the top story of the building upon which such structures are placed''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, in 1910, the Height of Buildings Act was signed into Federal law. That bill, in fact, envisioned a prevention of New York-style skyscrapers from being erected here in the Nation's Capital. That bill is every bit as important today as it was in 1910.

The District of Columbia has a unique visual requirement. We should not, cannot, and will not obstruct the Mall and the major parts of this historic city.

It is important that we maintain the skyline and the access, and we do so in every single consideration in this city. The memorials and monuments and public safety must be considered.

However, over the last two Congresses, the committee has been working on several small modifications that, really, time has said its time has come. After 100 years, the current legislation makes a small but meaningful change. Let me put it in words the American people can easily understand.

One hundred years ago, they put a limit on the height of these buildings, and then they put 20 feet beyond that limit of occupancy for water towers, coal stacks for the chimneys, and, of course, the tops of elevators. Those water towers, elevator shafts, chimneys, they were certainly pretty hideous, but they were necessary.

It is now 100 years later, and, in fact, the absence of other uses for these buildings often means that these tops of these buildings are not considered to be an aesthetically important part, and there is no funding and no source of revenue to make them better.

Under this modification to the Height Act, we allow for what have been called penthouses but, in fact, are simply industrial rooftop air conditioners and the like to be covered, wrapped, if you will, by architecturally pleasing structures.

These structures may be occupied. They may be offices, cafeterias, or, in the case of a residential apartment complex, it could be a top apartment.

Under the legislation, they have to have a setback. The setback is roughly 1 foot per foot of height, or 20 feet of setback if they go to the full 20 feet. So these are not a monolithic increase and, in fact, a setback consistent with that 100-year-old law.

Last Congress, the committee held numerous hearings on the Height Act and listened to countless witnesses. I subsequently wrote to the National Capital Planning Commission, often called the NCPC, and the mayor's office, asking them to jointly study modifications to the Height Act and recommend any changes they saw appropriate. For those who are unaware, NCPC is the regional planning commission that includes representatives of both the Federal interests and local interests.

The Height Act study is impressive. Aside from the research work, a series of meetings were held featuring considerable input from experts and the general public alike. Afterward, the mayor's office and NCPC provided separate recommendations.

The mayor's specific recommendation: increase the height limits in downtown. The mayor also recommended that the city and NCPC work together to be able to use the city comprehensive plan as a tool to adjust height limits outside the L'Enfant city region.

This is not in today's proposal. Ultimately, only after considering these broader changes, NCPC's only recommendation from the overall plan submitted by the mayor is, in fact, the modest proposal before you today.

Let's understand: the height of buildings in this city will not change by 1 foot under this act, but the beauty of the tops of buildings and the usability will.

The revenue to the city can increase because of the value of these top floors, and, yet, we will cover up mechanical penthouses that, today, are simply elevator shafts, rooftop air conditioners, water towers and the like.

So long as that ratio of setback and the other provisions of the 100-year-old act are maintained, the city will have the ability to approve structures.

But let's understand: those structures will still go through a rigorous program before they can be approved, and they will continue to be consistent with the 1910 Height Act.

NCPC itself recommended that human occupancy be allowed in such rooftop penthouses, so long as the setback ratio was maintained and that the penthouse does not exceed one story and that no more than 20 feet of height be maintained.

Our bill does everything in the NCPC recommendation. So this bill simply gives the city a little more latitude in

allowing human occupancy in penthouses where ugly mechanical penthouses already exist and are allowed.

I would like to have gone a little further on this bill, and I am very candid. There are areas well outside the city, as most people interpret it, far up in Northeast, where there are railroad tracks and industrial buildings, and down in Southeast, an area that ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has worked tirelessly to improve, that could have been given additional options for higher buildings because they are outside of the area of concern for the Mall and monuments.

The city is not prepared to take that authority yet, and Congress is not prepared to give authority that, in fact, its city council is not prepared to handle. That is the consensus that came from the city council in their own resolution, and we respect that if the city does not want an authority, we are not going to thrust an authority on them.

So, with respect to the Height Act, let me close by saying there will always be somebody who doesn't want a law changed, who, in fact, wants the buildings shorter. There are people who want their private home to be able to see all the way to the Mall. I would love to own one of those homes, quite frankly.

A few feet away from here I would like to be able to walk out onto the Speaker's deck, his balcony. I would like to be able to see the White House, but I can't because the Treasury building was built in front of it and others.

This legislation will not cause any of those shortcomings that have occurred in the past; just the opposite. It will beautify the tops of buildings if the city approves those specific projects, while maintaining the absolute limit that has been on these buildings since 1910.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4192, and I appreciate the initiative of the chairman, Chairman ISSA, who has just spoken, who has always observed the self-government rights of the District of Columbia, and puts forward this bill in the same spirit of home rule.

This legislation will amend the Height Act of 1910, which limits the height of all building in the District of Columbia. The District is prohibited, under the Home Rule Act, from permitting any structure anywhere in the city in excess of the height limitations contained in the Height Act.

The current law permits structures above the top story of buildings, including so-called penthouses, to exceed the height limitations, but no human occupancy is permitted in mechanical penthouses, and it gives the District the authority to set the maximum height for such structures.

Currently, the structures have a height limit of 18.6 feet. The legislation will allow human occupancy of these penthouses. In addition, the legislation will mandate a 20-foot maximum height, one story, and a 1 to 1 setback for penthouses. The absolute height of any penthouse used for human occupancy will be 20 feet.

I thank Chairman ISSA for examining the Height Act when he saw that it had received little congressional oversight in the century of its existence.

I supported Chairman ISSA's request that the District of Columbia and the National Capital Planning Commission conduct a joint study of the Height Act because more than 100 years had passed since the heights of D.C. buildings were systematically discussed in the Halls of Congress.

The District and the NCPC came to different conclusions as to whether or how the Height Act should be amended, but agreed with respect to removing the prohibition on human occupancy of penthouses, and setting a maximum height of 20 feet, or one story, for penthouses.

The mayor and D.C. Council expressed divergent views, but I encouraged them to work together to find common ground. I am pleased that the mayor and council chairman reached an agreement with regard to penthouses, and that agreement, in essence, is before the Congress today.

Under today's bill, the city, through its local zoning process, will have the home rule ability to permit human occupancy of penthouses if it would desire. However, this bill is not a mandate directing the city to make any changes to penthouses or to its existing comprehensive plan, or local zoning laws, more generally.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman ISSA for working to give the District of Columbia more authority. I also deeply appreciate the chairman's work in so many other ways, for budget autonomy, and his strong support on many occasions for home rule, which he has raised as a factor in connection with the Height Act as well.

I support the passage of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues. I am extremely pleased with the sensitivity that is expressed for the people of Washington, D.C., because that is what we should have here.

This is an amendment to the bill regarding the height of Washington, D.C., buildings that passed in 1910, as changing the height restrictions that were put in place in 1899; and as my colleague from the District of Columbia had pointed out, this really hasn't been discussed in detail in over 100 years.

I recently had someone here in Washington tell me that: Gee, as property gets so valuable here in Washington, you are going to see, at first, exceptions made to the height restrictions, then soon followed by a lifting of those restrictions because the money will be just too much for either party to turn down.

I am so grateful that the height is not being changed, as the chairman said, by one inch; but I am very concerned about beginning to make these exceptions for residence levels, even though ''residence'' is the change, basically, in essence, and I have looked at the change. I have reviewed the prior law.

But, Madam Speaker, I am concerned that this is the camel's nose going under the tent. You are beginning to put residences above the height that was previously allowed. It may dress some up, it may change some in ways that we are not crazy about, but I am just concerned about changing the height restrictions, even with these exceptions, after 114 years of being in existence.

So as a result, I thank the chairman and my friend from the District of Columbia, like I say, for their sensitivity, but I like the height restriction because of the emphasis that continues to be pushed.

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

Mr. ISSA. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned about beginning the exceptions that may move in a direction that we don't wish to have. The chairman mentioned that no one is granting that kind of authority, and nobody is seeking it, yet; and I want us to stop it before we have to get to that ''yet.''

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman for speaking in favor of the bill.

I understand his concern. I do want to indicate that no exception is really being made in this bill. The height can go no higher than it can go right now, and somebody in the District of Columbia can't make an exception because the Congress of the United States controls heights still under this bill.

Of course, we have our local zoning laws in the District, so there are many, many parts of the District where you can't begin to go as high as the Height Act.

I am a third-generation Washingtonian, and I must say that I adore the residential quality of this city, which is essentially built on the notion of private homes and not large-scale apartments. The city really did not want to dislodge that, and that has not occurred here.

There may still be some disagreement among residents, but I do know that when the council, which expressed some real disquiet at any change, has finally been able to come to an agreement, that there is not enough of a change here to warrant dissent within

the city and had come to an agreement that—and when, in addition, those who have been most adamant about maintaining the Height Act, including the organization which has been the real guardian of the Height Act, the Committee of 100, says it has no objection to this compromise, I think we have finally reached a compromise of the kind that we would like to see more often occur right here in the House of Representatives.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I want to urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4192, and I want to close by reminding people that this is, in fact, the best vetted piece of legislation for Congress to pass in cooperation with the city in my tenure.

Thirteen D.C. city councilmen signed on to a sense of council-introduced resolution in November that stated: The Height Act should not be amended at this time.

All 13 now support this modest recommendation, and I understand the additional member also would. I am glad that the city council is seeing this modest reform as in their favor—their benefit to enhancing the beauty of those buildings, those few buildings that reach the maximum of the Height Act.

In closing, I think it is important that we echo what Delegate NORTON just said. The vast majority of homes and buildings in the District of Columbia are far lower than the Height Act. In fact, it is a relatively small part of what some people sometimes call K Street and some other corridors, where the infrastructure of the city has pressed to occupy more densely.

My hope is, by maintaining the height, the total occupancy, these penthouses will enhance that property, in many cases, with cafeteria or public access areas while still continuing to induce people to make reasonable changes in outlying areas if, in fact, additional capacity is needed either for residents of this city or, in fact, the thriving businesses of this city.

Madam Speaker, we seldom come to you with a 100-year-old bill that hasn't been dusted off. We come to you today with a 104-year-old bill, which has not been dusted off and not for a lack of a reason.

The water towers of 1910 are gone. It is time for us to use this space to maintain a view that is unmarred by highrises, but is, in fact, enhanced by the architectural creation, invention, and ingenuity of the architects who work and strive to make the buildings of Washington, D.C., pleasant and functional.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4192, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam 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.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS ELIMINATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4194) to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4194

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 ''Government Reports Elimination Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 101. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) INFORMATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ON COMMODITY PROMOTION PROGRAMS.—Section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(b) UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES REPORT AND RELATED MEETING.—Section 108 of the Act of August 28, 1954 (commonly known as the Agricultural Act of 1954; 7 U.S.C. 1748) is repealed.

(c) FARMLAND PROTECTION POLICY ACT ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 1546 of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4207) is repealed.

(d) PEANUT BASE ACRES DATA COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION.—Section 1302(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8752(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(e) OTHER BASE ACRES DATA COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION.—Section 1101(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(f) BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS PILOT PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 333B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983b) is amended by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (f) through (h) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively.

(g) RURAL BROADBAND ACCESS PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking ''(k)'' and inserting ''(j)''; and

(2) by striking subsection (j) and redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively.

(h) REPORT ON EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES TO EMERGING MARKETS.—Section 1542(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1) EFFECT OF CREDITS.—''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

(i) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION QUARTERLY REPORT.—Section 13 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714k) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(j) EVALUATION OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT, BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM FINANCING OF LOCALLY OR REGIONALLY PRODUCED FOOD PRODUCTS.—Section 310B(g)(9)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(9)(B)) is amended by striking clause (iv) and redesignating clause (v) as clause (iv).

(k) UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REPORTS.—Section 17B of the United States