

Restoring and protecting these areas should be one of our highest concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill would ensure that logical organizations across the country in partnership with the EPA can protect and restore estuaries for the benefit of future generations. I support passage of this legislation and hope that this is the last time this House must act to send this important bill to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1523.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), who is a sponsor of the bill and has worked tirelessly to protect estuaries throughout the Nation.

□ 1600

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman GIBBS, Ranking Members DEFAZIO and NAPOLITANO, as well as my colleagues Mr. LARSEN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida for helping to draft this legislation and reauthorization. We all share the hope that this is the last go-around to get this done.

Estuaries across the country, including the Delaware Bay and Barnegat Bay estuaries in my district, have immeasurable economic, ecological, and environmental benefit. They deserve continued congressional support.

This version of the National Estuary Program reauthorization is a bipartisan, fiscally responsible compromise with the Senate that reduces the authorization by \$8.5 million. The important part is it ultimately increases the amount of money each estuary program will receive.

Unlike many programs under the Clean Water Act, the National Estuary Program is a nonregulatory program, uniquely designed to support the collaborative, voluntary efforts of Federal, State, and local stakeholders to restore degraded estuaries. Unfortunately, the NEPs have been losing money due to increasing EPA administrative costs. We have heard that before, but, in this particular case, it is really hurting.

To correct that, our legislation details precisely how the EPA is to spend the authorized and appropriated money. By setting limits of 5 percent for the EPA's administrative costs, we can guarantee 80 percent of the funding goes directly to the needs of the estuary and not bureaucratic salary and red tape.

Also, in this year's reauthorization, we have set aside 15 percent of the funding for a competitive award program. This program seeks applications to deal with urgent and challenging issues that threaten the ecological and economic well-being of coastal areas.

By structuring how the money is spent and lowering authorization levels, this legislation strikes the right

balance of fiscal and environmental responsibility. I want to thank my colleagues once again for their strong support of this, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important legislation to protect estuaries throughout the country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1523, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SPILL PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1684) to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to impose penalties and provide for the recovery of removal costs and damages in connection with certain discharges of oil from foreign offshore units, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1684

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 "Foreign Spill Protection Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. LIABILITY OF OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF FOREIGN FACILITIES.

(a) OIL POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.—Section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (26)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking "onshore or offshore facility, any person" and inserting "onshore facility, offshore facility, or foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or entity"; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking "offshore facility, the person who" and inserting "offshore facility or foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, the person or entity that"; and

(2) in paragraph (32)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) FOREIGN FACILITIES.—In the case of a foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or holder of a right of use and easement granted under applicable foreign law for the area in which the facility is located."; and

(C) in subparagraph (G), as so redesignated, by striking "or offshore facility, the persons who" and inserting "offshore facility, or

foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, the persons or entities that".

(b) FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.—Section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and any facility" and inserting "any facility"; and

(2) by inserting "and, for the purposes of applying subsections (b), (c), (e), and (o), any foreign offshore unit (as defined in section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act) or any other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone" after "public vessel".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. 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. 1684.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, following the *Exxon Valdez* disaster in Alaska in 1989, Congress passed the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, or OPA. The basic premise of OPA is that the party responsible for the spill is responsible for all of the costs of cleaning up the mess.

The *Deepwater Horizon* spill in 2010 reminded us of the impact a spill of its size can have on waters, coastlines, people, and our economy. It is important to note that these offshore facilities, as defined by OPA, are limited only to the navigable waters of the United States, and foreign rigs cannot be designated as responsible parties. Therefore, if there were an oil spill originating in foreign waters, the most the responsible party would have to pay to clean up American waters and shores is \$150 million.

This issue is of particular concern to Gulf States. Mexico, Cuba, and the Bahamas are actively looking at expanding their offshore drilling operations. Of particular concern is Mexico, which is looking into ultradeep wells, exceeding 6,000 feet in depth. In 2012, Mexico's top oil regulators said they were not prepared to handle a serious accident or major oil spill.

But it is not just the Gulf States that could be negatively affected by a spill. On the Canadian side of Lake Erie, offshore energy exploration is being conducted for natural gas. While Canadian law prohibits oil extraction from the Great Lakes, the risk of a spill persists. Again, under current law, the responsible party would only have to pay a maximum of \$150 million for cleanup.

In response to these concerns, my friend from Florida, Representative

PATRICK MURPHY, and I introduced the legislation that is being considered here today. The bill ensures that the responsible party, regardless of origin, pays for all American cleanup costs by applying OPA. This will also apply Clean Water Act penalties to the responsible foreign party.

I am proud that this legislation has broad bipartisan support and has been endorsed by environmental fishing and other groups that depend on the water for their livelihoods. Our coastal communities need peace of mind that if they are harmed by a foreign spill, resources are available to clean up their shores and help them recover. American taxpayers should not have to foot the bill to bail out the mistakes of foreign companies.

I would like to thank and commend the Coast Guard and the majority and minority staffs of the committee, particularly John Rayfield and Dave Jansen, for their work on this important legislation.

H.R. 1684 is a very straightforward bill that looks to hold the party responsible for a foreign oil spill that affects U.S. waters or lands accountable. I urge all Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this noncontroversial legislation that will clarify existing Federal authority regarding the liability for and enforcement of offshore oil spills originating from a foreign source outside the U.S. exclusive economic zone.

H.R. 1684, the Foreign Spill Protection Act of 2016, clarifies that owners and operators of oil production facilities located offshore and outside the United States are liable for cleanup costs and damages from oil spills. These foreign entities are responsible for oil spills that originate outside U.S. waters if they threaten or cause damage in the United States. The foreign entities would be subject to criminal and civil penalties, Federal removal authority, and any State-authorized remedy currently allowed under Federal and State law.

I would like to commend the cooperation shown by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman SHUSTER, Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee Chairman HUNTER, and Ranking Member GARAMENDI in working out the final details of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster painfully reminded us of how catastrophic an offshore oil spill can be, both in its geographic reach and in its environmental and economic costs.

The settled liability and enforcement regimes authorized under the Oil Pollution Act and the Clean Water Act have proven themselves to be comprehensive, durable, and effective. In the event of a spill, this response regime has ensured time and time again that the Federal Government has clear, un-

equivocal authority to respond to a spill, restore the environment and communities harmed, and recover damages for the harm caused. This legislation will in no way impede or change those indispensable authorities.

In closing, it is a helpful enhancement to clarify that spills originating from foreign sources fall under this well-established legal regime. I ask Members on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, for his statement and for his cooperation on this legislation. I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER.

As the gentleman mentioned, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is oftentimes an example of how we can put politics aside to work together and do good things for the American people. This legislation is very important to my constituents in south Florida, in the Florida Keys, and, really, to coastal communities all over the country. So I thank the gentleman for his statement. I thank everyone who had a part in crafting this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY), who is vitally interested and concerned about this legislation.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and I thank the gentleman from Oregon for their tireless efforts to protect our environment. As the gentleman from Florida and I know firsthand, so much of our economy is based on our environment. Making sure that we have clean water and clean air is exactly what we need to be focused on.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, ensuring the party responsible for such oil spills is held liable. Hopefully, we get bipartisan support going forward. I thank the two gentlemen for their work putting this forward.

I would also like to rise today in support of H.R. 2901, the Flood Insurance Market Parity and Modernization Act. I was proud to put this bipartisan legislation forward with my good friend, another gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) to clarify that private flood insurance may be an available option for homeowners to satisfy mandatory coverage requirements under the National Flood Insurance Program. For Florida homeowners, this is a win-win, giving them more options for flood insurance coverage and using new competition to drive down prices and expand coverage options for consumers.

The National Flood Insurance Program is an important tool that empowers and protects homeowners all across America. The Biggert-Waters Act of

2012 took an important step in opening up the market and allowing private flood insurance policies to satisfy mandatory coverage requirements under the program.

However, as we have learned, sometimes even the best laid plans can have unintended consequences. With a lack of clarity as to which private flood insurance policies are allowed in the program, the market has not been able to expand, and consumers have been left with just one choice to insure their properties from flood risk: the National Flood Insurance Program.

I recently heard from one of my constituents in Martin County, Florida, about how the premium for just 1 year of flood insurance coverage through the NFIP ended up being five times the price they expected it to be. To make matters worse, the maximum coverage was only half of what they paid for the home itself; yet they were required to purchase the higher priced plan that did not provide the coverage they needed because there were no other options.

This highlights the urgent need to allow competition in the flood insurance marketplace to meet homeowners' needs and drive down costs. But to do that, we must allow the States to license and regulate flood insurance policies, exactly like homeowners insurance, car insurance, or health insurance.

Yet, almost inexplicably, Florida's private flood insurance market remains restrained because homeowners are not given the choice to look to private market policies for more flood insurance options. The bank will not accept other policies because their regulators haven't approved them.

This bill will solve this problem by allowing State insurance commissioners, who have long been considered by Congress as the most appropriate regulators of insurance, to certify private insurance plans to provide equivalent or better protections for flood insurance other than the NFIP plan. Everyone I talk to agrees that Florida's insurance commissioner is certainly better equipped to regulate flood insurance in our State than the Federal banking regulators.

By breaking this down, we break down a major barrier to marketplace expansion. This legislation will foster more competition, greatly benefiting homeowners across Florida and the Nation.

I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman HENSARLING, for his leadership on this issue. I also extend my deep gratitude to the gentlewoman from California, Ranking Member WATERS, for her relentless advocacy for consumers and for working with us to improve this legislation and produce a solid, bipartisan outcome.

I appreciate all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for moving this commonsense measure forward with unanimous, bipartisan support.

□ 1615

I am hopeful that today it will be passed by the full House with similar support and will be swiftly considered in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2901, the Flood Insurance Market Parity and Modernization Act.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. MURPHY), whom I saw in the Everglades on Friday. We were celebrating another great victory for Floridians there.

Here today we are again celebrating that we have been able to get something done with the support of our colleagues on behalf of the people of our State.

We decided early on in this Congress that we would work together to protect our coastal communities, and that is exactly what we are doing here today.

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 Florida (Mr. CURBELO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1684, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMBATING TERRORIST RECRUITMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4820) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to use the testimonials of former or estranged violent extremists or their associates in order to counter terrorist recruitment, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4820

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 “Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. DIRECTIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall incorporate, to the extent practicable, into Department of Homeland Security efforts to combat terrorist recruitment and communications the public testimonials of former violent extremists or their associates, including friends and family. Such efforts may include the following:

(1) Counter-messaging of foreign terrorist organization communications and narratives.

(2) Related community engagement and public education efforts.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, where appropriate, co-

ordinate the efforts described in subsection (a) with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, and, to the extent practicable, engage nongovernmental and international partners in the identification and use of testimonials described in such subsection.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to collect testimonials directly from former violent extremists or their associates, including friends and family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of the Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act of 2016. I commend Mr. FLEISCHMANN for offering this bipartisan counterterrorism bill at a time when we are in the highest terror threat environment since 9/11.

We have more than 1,000 homegrown terror investigations in all 50 States, and we have arrested over 80 ISIS supporters in our country, many for plotting attacks.

Terrorists are radicalizing our citizens online and across borders, which is why we need this legislation. It requires that the Secretary of Homeland Security use the testimonials of former extremists and defectors to help stop terrorist recruitment.

President Obama himself—and I agree with him on this issue—argued last year: We need to lift up the voice of those who know the hypocrisy of groups like ISIS firsthand, including former extremists.

He also noted: “Former extremists . . . can be powerful messengers in debunking these terrorist ideologies.”

Our foreign partners are already using these types of testimonials overseas. So is our State Department. But we need to be doing this counter-messaging here at home.

Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson said in front of my committee last month: My priority has been focusing on communities that I believe are most vulnerable to the appeals from ISIS, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups overseas who are actively targeting individuals in these communities . . . This is as important as any of our other homeland security missions.

I commend Secretary Johnson for his words and his work, but we are not act-

ing quickly enough. That is why this bill was one of the top recommendations of the bipartisan task force we created last year to look at this threat.

In their final report, the Democratic and Republican Members who led the task force said America needed to launch a concerted effort to use the testimonials of former extremists to combat terrorist propaganda.

This is from a Virginia defector. Just last month an ISIS defector from Virginia was picked up in Iraq. He said he wanted to send a message to the American people that life with ISIS was miserable and that the group did not represent Islam. These are the types of voices we need to amplify so as to keep others from making the same mistakes.

Some have argued that this bill limits the DHS in allowing it only to counter-message groups like ISIS and al Qaeda, but that is simply false. In fact, at our markup, legislative counsel told the members: “The current language in the bill is extremely broad-based. It does not place a limitation on anything.”

Although our bipartisan task force focused on foreign terrorist threats, the bill gives the Secretary the flexibility to address the full array of dangerous groups that threaten our people both here at home and abroad. I am proud to say that the majority of Republicans and Democrats on the House Homeland Security Committee support this legislation.

Terrorists are recruiting our citizens at the speed of broadband. So we can’t move at the speed of bureaucracy. Today Congress has an opportunity to fight back. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 4820, the Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act of 2016.

It is troubling that some of my colleagues have circulated misinformation about this bill. Let me set the record straight.

The Department of Homeland Security has repeatedly told my committee that H.R. 4820 is unnecessary insofar as the Department can already integrate public testimonials of former terrorists and violent extremists into its efforts to counter violent extremism and terrorism.

In fact, yesterday I spoke with Secretary Johnson, and he reiterated that DHS has the authority it needs to carry out its countering violent extremism efforts and that this bill is unnecessary.

I oppose H.R. 4820 today for the same reason I opposed it when it was considered earlier this month in committee. H.R. 4820 is nothing more than a message bill, a bill that sends the message to DHS to focus its counter-messaging efforts on foreign terrorist groups.