Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the Voting Rights Act in 1965.

Mr. President, you are doing the right thing. I stand with you on exercising your executive authority. We need mercy for these people who are desperate.

PROMOTING NEW MANUFACTURING ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4795, Promoting New Manufacturing Act.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 756 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4795.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0914

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4795) to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, President Obama has made it very clear that if the U.S. Congress does not pass legislation that he has said that is a priority for his administration, that he intends to accomplish his goals by the use of executive orders and through regulations. Today, with H.R. 4795, we are here to address a specific problem caused by regulations coming out of EPA relating to the Clean Air Act.

We know that announcements have been made for manufacturing expansions in the United States amounting to about $135 billion. But we also know that EPA has gone into a pattern of when they issue new regulations, it takes them sometimes years to come up with guidances so that State EPAs and manufacturing applicants for clean air permits will know what is required to meet the new regulations. Because of the lack of clarity and the time of meeting timely guidances, it creates great confusion and uncertainty for the States and for the specific manufacturing facilities trying to meet these requirements.

To give you an example, the last ozone rule that was adopted by the EPA in 2008, the guidance for people trying to meet those requirements of that regulation still have not been issued. So we find ourselves in a situation where these new regulations are creating great obstacles to economic growth in the United States, and I think all of us recognize that economic growth has been quite stagnant for some time.

We have had many hearings on this issue, and we hear from people on a regular basis that one of the reasons that they can't get new plants built is because of the uncertainty, the lack of clarity, the lack of guidance from the EPA when they come out with new regulations.

Anyone that follows EPA is quite aware that they are particularly aggressive in new regulations. They have come out with new regulations on the Clean Air Act on a regular basis for the last 4 years. And so once again we find ourselves with lack of clarity, lack of guidance from EPA.

This legislation, which was introduced by Mr. SCALISE, simply says to EPA, if you come out with a new regulation, simultaneously you must provide the guidance for the States and the individual applicants who will be required to obtain permits to build their manufacturing facility. So that is what this bill is all about.

I think it is a commonsense piece of legislation, and obviously all of us want to create new jobs. We have companies out there today with a lot of cash who want to produce these, build these new plants, but because of bureaucratic difficulties, lack of clarity, and lack of guidance on a timely basis from the EPA, it makes it extremely difficult to do.

So that is why we are here today to discuss this legislation. I think it is very important that we adopt this legislation.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This has been a fascinating week in terms of the environment. We started it with the President orchestrating one of the truly groundbreaking breakthroughs in carbon emissions and getting the Chinese, for the first time, to agree to limit their carbon emissions, setting new standards for the United States.

Then this week, in the Congress, we basically have three bills that are the equivalent of saying, through statute, to polluters, ''Smoke 'em if you got 'em.'' I mean, three bills that represent one of the worst trifectas I have ever seen, and I come from horse racing country.

Yesterday we voted on a bill that, in the title, suggests that we are somehow improving the science behind the environment, and basically what it did was limit the ability of EPA to have scientists as part of the decision-making process. Today we are discussing the so-called Promoting New Manufacturing Act, and, as we heard from my good friend from Kentucky, the goal of the legislation is to facilitate a manufacturing renaissance in the United States by expediting air permits for new facilities.

But the premise of the bill is very flawed: new manufacturing facilities aren't being held back by clean air requirements; weakening the Clean Air Act won't create jobs; and the specific provisions of this bill will slow down permitting, not speed it up. In truth, this bill is yet another Republican attempt to weaken the Clean Air Act protections and attack EPA's authority to reduce harmful air pollution.

The Clean Air Act requires major new or expanding sources of air pollution to obtain permits with pollution limits before the facilities start construction. It is a lot easier and less costly to minimize air pollution when you are designing and building a facility compared to cleaning up existing facilities.

These pre-construction permits are based on a simple principle: a new facility should not increase local air pollution above levels that are safe to breathe. The bill before us violates this principle by creating a permitting loophole, allowing new facilities to obtain permits under old, less protective air quality standards unless EPA promulgates new regulations or guidelines.

This provision is bad for existing manufacturing in the United States. The permitting loophole would actually impose new costs on the manufacturing sector rather than help it. The bill allows new facilities to pollute more than their fair share, leaving the existing manufacturers to make up the difference.

In areas struggling to clean up their air, like in my district in Louisville, Kentucky, this effectively shifts the responsibility and cost of pollution control to existing manufacturing facilities. This provision does not make economic sense. Furthermore, in all of the limited testimony pursuant to considering this bill, there was not one company identified that actually said they would build a manufacturing facility if they could do it under older guidelines.

I am kind of amused that the Republicans now want the EPA to issue nationwide guidelines, when their ideology says States are better prepared to deal with issues at their own level; and, in fact, States, under the existing law, have done a very, very good job of creating guidelines and strategies for meeting problems with pollution in their jurisdiction.

So, for a wide variety of reasons, this bill doesn't accomplish what its title suggests, and we urge its defeat.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I might say that during the time we had the hearing on this legislation, we had several State representatives from the State EPA come in and testify, and they all were talking about the absence of timely implementation guidance from EPA produces a lack of clarity.

Both the Colorado, Arkansas, even the National Association of Clean Air Agencies wrote a letter to EPA on September 4, 2013, complaining about this.

Now, I would remind everyone, this bill does not do anything about the science, trying to diminish the importance of science and coming forth with new regulations. All it does is says that if EPA comes out with a new regulation under the Clean Air Act, they must provide the guidance to the States and to the entities who want to build new plants.

I might also say that the American Chemistry Council, particularly, raised this issue with us—and through their membership—of companies trying to build new manufacturing plants and meeting great difficulty because of the lack of clarity.

I might also say, all of us are very much concerned about climate change, but I don't think America has to take a backseat to any other country in the world. Our CO_2 emissions are the lowest that they have been in 20 years.

I might also say, we find ourselves today, because of regulations from this administration, being one of the only countries in the world where you cannot build a new coal-fired plant to produce electricity because the technology is not available to meet the stringent emissions standard unless you are going to spend huge sums of government money, as they are in the Kemper plant in Mississippi.

By the way, the standard was set for that regulation, the emission standard, based on the Kemper plant, which is still not in operation. It is about 2 years overdue, is way over cost, and all the entities involved in it said that kind of plant would never be built again without huge government dollars involved.

We would like to get back to a situation in America where, on energy projects, we use private money. I notice that Google recently was involved in the Ivanpah Solar facility out west, one of the largest in the world. They used a lot of government loans to build that plant, and now Google and other companies are coming back to the government and applying for grants to help pay off the loans.

So this is a commonsense piece of legislation. It does not change the science; it simply provides additional clarity.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from Kentucky for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4795. It was my hope to resolve the issues of this bill during the committee. Unfortunately, that was not the case.

H.R. 4795, the Promoting New Manufacturing Act, could be a solution to a longstanding problem. The problem relates to Federal permitting, in this case, New Source Review permits.

While the majority of permitting takes place at the State level, the EPA plays a critical role in the permitting process. When EPA promulgates a final National Ambient Air Quality Standard, called NAAQS, States and industry must respond through implementation and application, respectively.

EPA should work as quickly as possible to offer States guidance on how to implement these new standards. Lack of guidance can lead to significant permitting delays as industry is forced to submit incomplete New Source Review applications.

While I will support the intent of the bill, I can't support the bill itself. H.R. 4795 is ultimately a lengthy delay in the National Ambient Air Quality Standards implementation; and then a NAAQS standard cannot be implemented, and this bill does not reflect current negotiations over that NAAQS implementation.

Until this point, the administration and the EPA have indicated a willingness to work on this issue. Further, EPA has not proposed these new National Ambient Air Quality Standards, so I see this bill as a solution to a problem that doesn't yet exist.

I want EPA to be transparent and work with the industry, and H.R. 4795 does not support a collaborative working relationship.

Additionally, the New Source Review permitting and the construction of new facilities are important to the economy, but we must also have a balance between economic growth and the protection of public health. The bill, unfortunately, does not strike that balance effectively, and, for that reason, I am unable to vote in favor of it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

If experience has taught us anything over the past two decades, it is that the Clean Air Act has been a success. New businesses have started, the economy has grown, and the air is cleaner and, beyond that, healthier for all of us.

□ 0930

The adjustments to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards Act are about a large body of research on the impacts of air pollutants on human health and the environment. H.R. 4795 assumes we cannot continue that record of success. The predictions of dire consequences to our economy before and after Congress adopted the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act have never materialized. We have, however, grown our economy and have achieved cleaner, healthier air for everyone. So, contrary to its title, this bill does nothing to promote manufacturing. It is simply another of many attempts to undermine the Clean Air Act.

Instead of bringing this partisan bill to the floor—yet another bill that has no chance of becoming law—we could be working together on legislation that would reinvigorate our domestic manufacturing sector. We could pass pending tax legislation or, better yet, tax reform, which would provide the certainty, provide the fairness, and provide the clarity that everyone needs and deserves. If it were enacted, this bill before us would be more likely to cause confusion and legal challenges than to generate new manufacturing jobs.

States develop comprehensive implementation plans that take account of all possible pollution sources and balance the needs of all stakeholders in the effort to achieve cleaner air. H.R. 4795 would allow a new facility to operate under less strict air quality standards than existing facilities if the EPA has not issued all final regulations and guidance required for any type of facility that would be covered by a newly established standard.

If the Agency would call a standard into question by issuing guidance at a time after a regulation is finalized, why would the Agency ever do that? Guidance is useful for the regulated community. As new or unique situations arise, the Agency can work with applicants to find the most appropriate and most cost-effective means for moving a project forward under the law.

It seems to me that we want to simplify the regulatory process, not complicate it, and to encourage communication and flexibility, not stifle them. We should ensure that regulations are implemented fairly and consistently, and we should facilitate communication and encourage the Agency to work with regulated entities.

H.R. 4795 is going to result in greater confusion, more legal challenges, and a less flexible regulatory process. H.R. 4795 will not provide more jobs, and it will not deliver clean air. I reject the notion that clean air and economic progress are incompatible. They simply are not. H.R. 4795 is a bad bill, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, it is now my great honor to yield such time

as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), one of the truly great champions of the environment who has ever served in this body.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank my colleague for those generous comments, and I am pleased to be here today to express why this bill should not pass.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is called the Promoting New Manufacturing Act. We would all want to do that—what a nice title—but the bill does not live up to the title.

The bill does not do anything to promote manufacturing, and it does not do anything to improve the permitting process for new and expanding facilities, but it does weaken air quality protections. It allows more pollution, and it threatens public health. Now, let me explain why I reached that conclusion.

The Clean Air Act requires a new or an expanding source of air pollution to obtain permits with pollution limits before the facility starts construction. These pre-construction permits ensure that a new or an expanded facility will not increase local air pollution to levels that violate National Ambient Air Quality Standards, which are based on public health.

When the EPA issues a new, more protective air quality standard to reflect the latest science, permit applicants have to meet the new standard and show their emissions will not increase the amount of pollution that will then end up harming public health. This bill, H.R. 4795, creates a loophole in this process.

The bill says that, if it is a new or an expanding facility, they can apply for a permit based on the old air quality standard, which is not adequate to protect the public health, unless, they say, the EPA has been able to jump over a new procedural hurdle that they set with this legislation requiring new regulations on permitting. In effect, this bill could give new sources of pollution amnesty from new air quality standards. This amnesty provision could have serious, real-world consequences. The amnesty provision would force the States and the EPA to issue permits for facilities that pollute more than they would under current law. In fact, this bill would allow new facilities to degrade air quality to levels that are not safe to breathe.

This loophole is also bad for business because, if you are not getting the reductions from new sources, you are going to have to get those reductions from existing sources. It is shifting the burden from the new sources onto existing facilities. It raises pollution control costs overall because the whole doctrine under the Clean Air Act, which has long been recognized, is that it is generally far more efficient and cost-effective to build pollution controls into a facility upfront rather than adding them later, but this bill does the opposite.

When we had our hearing, Representative DINGELL asked the Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources from the State of Delaware whether creating this loophole in the Clean Air Act would do anything to expedite permitting at his agency. He responded with a categorical ''no.''

The California Air Resources Board argues this bill would actually slow the permitting process.

It wrote:

> Waiting for the U.S. EPA to develop guidance will result in unnecessary delays and public health risks because permitting agencies appear to be barred from issuing permits consistent with the new, more health-protective air quality standards until the U.S. EPA provides guidance.

If we really want to expedite the permitting process, we should give the EPA and the State and local agencies more resources. This bill does not add a single penny more to the EPA or to State and local permitting agencies to hire more staff to review and process these permits. That is what the agencies need.

States don't need more loopholes. They don't need more lectures about so-called ''red tape.'' They need more money and more people, but instead of providing these resources, House Republicans have voted repeatedly to slash funding for environmental protection. Punching holes in the Clean Air Act won't help these cash-strapped agencies work any faster, but it will make the air dirtier. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) has 23 minutes remaining, and the other gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), who has been a real leader on this issue.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his work on this particular issue that is really important to the Third District in Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Promoting New Manufacturing Act.

For too long, the Obama economy has remained weak, and the American worker has suffered the consequences. Too many people are struggling to find work and to provide for their families. They want to know when things are finally going to pick up.

We in Congress have a responsibility to help create an economic environment that allows individuals to succeed and businesses to grow, and we can achieve that kind of success by cutting back on job-killing regulations, by removing bureaucratic red tape, and by increasing transparency. That is what this bill today is all about.

As a Representative from Indiana, I understand that a strong manufacturing industry is absolutely critical to our national and local economies. The Third Congressional District, the place that I call home, is one of the top manufacturing districts in the entire country. This bill will not only bring new opportunities to Hoosier families but to families all across America.

Strengthening our manufacturing industry should not be a partisan issue, and, today, we have an opportunity to stand together and support legislation that will help create jobs and move our economy in the right direction.

I would like to thank Whip SCALISE, Chairman UPTON, and the members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for their hard work on this issue, and I would urge my colleagues to support this particular legislation.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I would say that some of the top issues that I hear from folks as I travel across the district back home in northeast Indiana are those of regulations and the effect of Washington, D.C., bureaucracy and red tape. The impact that it is having on jobs in Indiana and across the country is hurting, and they need relief.

Again, I would definitely urge my colleagues to support this particular legislation. Let's start taking the boot off of the American economy, and let's let it and its families succeed.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I close my side of the argument, I would like to take this opportunity, once again, to thank my colleague Mr. WAXMAN for his incredible service to this body and to the country over the last several decades.

One of the first things I did when I was elected to Congress in 2006 was to call Mr. WAXMAN to ask if I could serve under his leadership on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee because I respected him so much. He has been a phenomenal mentor to me, as he has been to hundreds of other Members of Congress over the years, and I think the country owes him a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, in the spirit of his championing of the environment, what we have seen again this week, not just with this bill but with the two other bills in the last 2 days, is kind of a ''wolf in sheep's clothing'' approach to the environment—dressing legislation up with very, very nice-sounding titles that essentially do exactly the opposite of what they are intending to do.

This bill, far from promoting manufacturing, will make it much more difficult for the EPA to set rules, and in the process, it will not accomplish anything in encouraging manufacturing. I don't know of one businessperson who would say, ''I am going to build a plant that I, otherwise, would not build because I get to build it under old pollution rules.'' Most businesspeople are very forward looking. They look for opportunities not to exploit the environment. They look for opportunities to

make money because they have a vision. Virtually every good businessperson I know these days understands that building facilities that have the latest technologies and the cleanest technologies is the way to make money and to make sound business decisions.

For all of those reasons, as Mr. WAXMAN laid out in very clear terms, this bill does not promote manufacturing. It will do, actually, the opposite, so we urge the defeat of the legislation.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I might say that I certainly agree that the owners of these manufacturing plants do not want to build new plants while using old rules. They want to use the best technology, but they want clear guidance from the EPA about what it should be because, when they don't have that, they find themselves involved with lawsuits with all sorts of environmental groups on a regular basis.

I might also say that there are many reports out there relating to manufacturing—I am just going to read from a few—that state that one of the key factors for investor confidence is a timely and efficient permitting process that is matched to current technologies.

Ken Weiss, global managing partner for Environmental Resources Management, which has extensive experience in the permitting process, testified:

> We routinely advise clients that obtaining a PSD permit can take anywhere from 1 to 3 years and that a minimum of 12 to 18 months need to be allowed in the project schedule.

□ 0945

The President, himself, acknowledged in his latest State of the Union speech this year that projects were being delayed and that there is a need to ''cut red tape'' to get factories built. And that is what this legislation is about. We are not telling EPA what the regulations should be. We are not telling EPA to disregard science. We are simply telling EPA, with all of their expertise, that when they issue the new regulation, that they provide clear guidance for the States and the companies and the individuals and the entities that want to build these new plants with new technology. That is what this legislation is all about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, America is on the verge of becoming an energy superpower. Not only do we possess more energy than any other country, but we are capable of using that energy to accomplish great things.

Perhaps most important of all to manufacturing states like Michigan, we can use our energy advantage to reverse the gradual decline in American manufacturing that has been going on for decades and create a real resurgence in the years ahead. The Promoting New Manufacturing Act will help us achieve that goal and continues our efforts to build the Architecture of Abundance.

The U.S. has all the ingredients to strengthen our domestic manufacturing dominance. We have the affordable energy supply to run our factories, especially our growing abundance of natural gas. We have private investors willing to invest billions of dollars on new projects in America. We have a workforce that is second to none but many of whom need jobs. And we have the technical knowledge to build manufacturing facilities that are the cleanest and most efficient in the world. All we need is a regulatory process that will allow it to happen.

We all know about Keystone XL, which despite our best efforts, is still caught up in red tape. I wish I could say that bureaucratic nightmare is an isolated incident, but sadly, it isn't. Potential future manufacturing facilities face a similar regulatory maze that can delay projects for years on end or stop them outright.

We want to be a world leader in manufacturing, not in red tape. I am glad the President identified the potential of new American manufacturing in his State of the Union address, and acknowledged that there is red tape that needs to be cleared away. Passage of H.R. 4795 will help make this goal a reality.

The Promoting New Manufacturing Act is a good starting point. We know changes to National Ambient Air Quality Standards are on the horizon, which will ultimately have an impact on how much of this manufacturing renaissance we can actually get permitted into existence. This bill takes some very sensible steps toward a more transparent and timely process for air permits under EPA's New Source Review program. It increases transparency by making more information publicly available on these permit applications, and gives the states and permit applicants the critical information they need to ensure that when it comes to air quality standards, future implementation rules and guidance documents are developed, proposed, and finalized in a timely manner.

I hope that we can all agree that the current regulatory process leaves room for improvement. I urge my colleagues to support our pending manufacturing renaissance and to support this constructive legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4795

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 ''Promoting New Manufacturing Act''.

SEC. 2. BUILDING AND MANUFACTURING PROJECTS DASHBOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, with respect to fiscal year 2008 and each subsequent fiscal year, publish in a readily accessible location on the Environmental Protection Agency's public Website the Agency's estimate of the following:

(1) The total number of preconstruction permits issued during the fiscal year.

(2) The percentage of such preconstruction permits issued within one year after the date of filing of a completed application.

(3) The average length of time for the Agency's Environmental Appeals Board to issue a final decision on petitions appealing decisions to grant or deny a preconstruction permit application.

(b) INITIAL PUBLICATION; UPDATES.—The Administrator shall—

(1) make the publication required by subsection (a) for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) update such publication not less than annually.

(c) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section:

(1) With respect to information to be published for fiscal years 2008 through 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency's estimates shall be based on information that is in the Agency's possession as of the date of enactment of this Act, including information in the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse database.

(2) With respect to information to be published for any fiscal year, nothing in the section compels the Environmental Protection Agency to seek or collect any information in addition to the information that is voluntarily provided by States and local air agencies for the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse database.

SEC. 3. TIMELY ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE TO ADDRESS NEW OR REVISED NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS IN PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In publishing any final rule establishing or revising a national ambient air quality standard, the Administrator shall, as the Administrator determines necessary and appropriate to assist States, permitting authorities, and permit applicants, concurrently publish regulations and guidance for implementing the standard, including information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under the new or revised standard.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF STANDARD TO PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITTING.—If the Administrator fails to publish final regulations and guidance that include information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under a new or revised national ambient air quality standard concurrently with such standard, then such standard shall not apply to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application until the Agency has published such final regulations and guidance.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) After publishing regulations and guidance for implementing national ambient air quality standards under subsection (a), nothing in this section shall preclude the Environmental Protection Agency from issuing subsequent regulations or guidance to assist States and facilities in implementing such standards.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to eliminate the obligation of a preconstruction permit applicant to install best available control technology and lowest achievable emissions rate technology, as applicable.

SEC. 4. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ACTIONS TO EXPEDITE REVIEW OF PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) identifying the activities being undertaken by the Environmental Protection Agency to increase the efficiency of the preconstruction permitting process;

(2) identifying the specific reasons for delays in issuing—

(A) preconstruction permits required under part C of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7470 et seq.) beyond the one-year statutory deadline mandated by section 165(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7475(c)); or

(B) preconstruction permits required under part D of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.) beyond the one-year period beginning on the date on which the permit application is determined to be complete;

(3) describing how the Agency is resolving delays in making completeness determinations for preconstruction permit applications;

(4) describing how the Agency is resolving processing delays for preconstruction permits, including any increases in communication with State and local permitting authorities; and

(5) summarizing and responding to public comments concerning the report received under subsection (b).

(b) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Before submitting each report required by subsection (a), the Administrator shall publish a draft report on the Website of the Environmental Protection Agency and provide the public with a period of at least 30 days to submit comments on the draft report.

(c) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section compels the Environmental Protection Agency to seek or collect any information in addition to the information that is voluntarily provided by States and local air agencies for the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse database.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''best available control technology'' has the meaning given to that term in section 169(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7479(3)).

(3) LOWEST ACHIEVABLE EMISSIONS RATE.—The term ''lowest achievable emissions rate'' has the meaning given to that term in section 171(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7501(3)).

(4) MAJOR EMITTING FACILITY; MAJOR STATIONARY SOURCE.—The terms ''major emitting facility'' and ''major stationary source'' have the meaning given to those terms in section 302(j) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7602(j)).

(5) NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD.—The term ''national ambient air quality standard'' means a national ambient air quality standard for an air pollutant under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409) that is finalized on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(6) PRECONSTRUCTION PERMIT.—The term ''preconstruction permit''—

(A) means a permit that is required under part C or D of title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7470 et seq.) for the construction or modification of a major emitting facility or major stationary source; and

(B) includes any such permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency or a State, local, or tribal permitting authority.

(7) RACT/BACT/LAER CLEARINGHOUSE DATABASE.—The term ''RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse database'' means the central database of air pollution technology information that is posted on the Environmental Protection Agency's Website.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 113–626. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 113–626.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of my colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 3(b), strike ''If the Administrator fails'' and insert

(1) STANDARD NOT APPLICABLE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if the Administrator fails

At the end of section 3(b), add the following:

(2) STANDARD APPLICABLE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application by a Federal, State, local, or tribal permitting authority if such authority determines that application of such paragraph is likely to—

(A) increase air pollution that harms human health and the environment;

(B) slow issuance of final preconstruction permits;

(C) increase regulatory uncertainty;

(D) foster additional litigation;

(E) shift the burden of pollution control from new sources to existing sources of pollution, including small businesses; or

(F) increase the overall cost of achieving the new or revised national ambient air quality standard in the applicable area.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, subsection 3(b) creates a loophole in the Clean Air Act that allows new facilities to meet old air quality standards. This means more pollution will enter the air, and it will be harder to clean up. When one facility is allowed to pollute more, other facilities in the area will have to invest more to reduce their emissions. That is not fair. That is not good for the economy. This loophole harms public health, burdens existing facilities, and creates regulatory uncertainty.

If one is unwilling to remove the loophole from the bill entirely, then we should at the very least give State and local permitting authorities the opportunity to opt out, and that is what this amendment does.

We know States have concerns about this provision. We heard strong concerns from the State of Delaware at the hearing on this bill. In my own State of California, the California Air Resources Board wrote to the committee last week to express their serious concerns about this legislation, and this provision in particular. CARB wrote that ''the provisions proposed in this bill would not increase efficiency, would result in additional delays in permitting, and would pose increased public health risks.''

They, in other words, made two key points. First of all, CARB explained that States don't need EPA guidance to issue permits under a new air quality standard. They said, ''For decades, permitting authorities have successfully implemented their programs in response to every new standard U.S. EPA has promulgated. In fact, permitting agencies have historically been the advisers to U.S. EPA on the guidance that it ultimately issues.'' They point out that the bill effectively requires EPA to issue '''one size fits all' permit guidance that could not realistically take into account the uniqueness of every jurisdiction.''

CARB also explained that in regions with severe air quality issues, barring the States from issuing permits consistent with new, more health-protective air quality standards will ''result in unnecessary delays and public health risks.'' CARB highlighted that ''this is particularly an issue for vulnerable and already overburdened populations, such as in disadvantaged communities.''

All of California's San Joaquin Valley is in extreme non-attainment for air quality standards. This bill threatens the flexibility needed by the regional air pollution control district, the flexibility that has led to 2013 being the cleanest year on record in this region. This bill would take a step backward in that progress.

Let's not make State air pollution regulators' jobs harder by constraining their flexibility and imposing counterproductive requirements. At least let's give them a choice.

The amendment simply says, if a Federal, State, local, or tribal agency determines that adopting this loophole will increase air pollution that harms human health, slow issuance of permits, increase regulatory uncertainty, create new regulation, shift the burden of pollution control to small businesses and other existing facilities, or increase the cost of achieving breathable air, then that agency may opt out. The agency does not have to issue a permit that exempts a new facility from meeting protective air quality standards.

If you don't think the bill's Clean Air Act loophole will cause these problems, then States wouldn't opt out, and you shouldn't object to this amendment. But just in case the States we have heard from are correct, let's provide a safety hatch to make sure that we aren't harming public health and making air pollution permitting more difficult.

I have heard my colleagues, especially on the Republican side of the aisle, say over and over again, We don't need one size fits all. We need to let localities make some of these determinations. And I agree, in this case particularly, that if they see, given their circumstances, a reason why they don't want to follow this new regime that would be created by this legislation, let them opt out. Let them decide at the local level how to proceed.

For that reason, I urge passage of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, this amendment basically would eliminate section 3(b), or make it applicable in a different way of the legislation, which really would defeat the whole purpose of this bill.

As I said in the beginning, this is very simple. We are not telling EPA what the regulations should be. We are not telling EPA not to use science. We are simply telling EPA, when you come out with a new regulation, you must provide the guidance for the States and for the entities that are trying to build new plants to create jobs in America. So this amendment would simply change that process.

All of us understand and recognize the great contribution that has been made by the Clean Air Act, but yet anytime we try to come up and we try to amend the Clean Air Act, it is almost like we are touching the Holy Grail.

Things change over time. As I said, the EPA has been so aggressive with so many regulations, they are not providing the guidance for clarity so that entities can invest dollars to create jobs. Obviously we want to balance a good, clean environment, but we also want a healthy economy. That is what this legislation is designed to do.

And with as much admiration and respect that I have for the gentlemen from California, Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. MCNERNEY, I do oppose this amendment and ask that the Members not adopt it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 113–626.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 10, insert the following:

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of a State, local, or tribal permitting authority to impose more stringent emissions requirements pursuant to State, local, or tribal law than Federal national ambient air quality standards established by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, as I have said repeatedly, the intent of this bill is to ensure that when the EPA issues new air quality standards, the Agency provides timely guidance about how to comply with the new standards in the permitting process.

Now, at the hearings that we have had and in individual discussion with other Members, people have argued that section 3(b) of this bill would prevent a State or local permitting authority that wanted to impose the new standards, even in the absence of EPA implementing regulations and guidance, from doing so. So that was not the intent of the bill, and this amendment clarifies that.

So if you have a State like California or even Delaware, which are the two that I can think of, that would like to go on and impose the new standard without the guidance, then this amendment ensures that they have the opportunity to do that. So that is what this amendment does. It is simply a clarification.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I qualified it is because I see no reason to oppose the amendment. It is not objectionable. But it doesn't actually fix the bill's four problems.

Subsection 3(b) of the bill gives new sources amnesty from compliance with a new or revised air quality standard until EPA issues rules and guidance on the implementation of the air quality standard.

The provision effectively creates two classes of sources. New sources would be permitted under the outdated and less protected air standard, but existing sources would be permitted under the updated, more protective standards. This amendment doesn't affect this requirement in any way.

The Whitfield amendment says that States can set their own more stringent air quality standards under State law. I don't disagree with that. Section 116 of the Clean Air Act already gives the States the right to adopt more stringent air quality standards. It has been in the Clean Air Act for decades. That is fine as far as it goes, but it doesn't address our concern with subsection 3(b).

If my colleagues are in favor of State flexibility, they should either oppose the underlying bill entirely or support the State opt-out amendment. The Whitfield amendment does not provide them any relief from the loophole and procedural burden envisioned under the bill.

I don't object to this amendment as it doesn't make the bill worse. It doesn't make it worse, but it doesn't make it better. I would urge my colleagues to oppose the bill, even if this amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I would just remind everyone that even if EPA fails to do its job, the bill makes clear that nothing relieves new facilities of their obligations to install the best available control technology in attainment areas and the lowest available emissions rate technology in non-attainment areas.

I would also say that while my amendment allows those States who want to go on and implement the new regulation without the guidance, they can do that; but on the other hand, our legislation is designed to protect those States and those entities who find that they are unable to interpret the new regulation. And because of that uncertainty, it has been the experience of many companies, when they build new facilities with technology under new regulations, they end up being sued over it frequently.

So this legislation is about common sense. This amendment allows those States that want to implement the stricter standard, they have the ability to do that. I would urge the adoption of this amendment and the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 1 minute just for clarification for the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. WHITFIELD mentioned that the National Association of Clean Air Agencies would like timely implementation guidance. That is true. But just yesterday, they wrote a letter making clear they oppose this bill.

I insert in the RECORD the letter that came under the signature of S. William Becker, National Association of Clean Air Agencies.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLEAN AIR AGENCIES,
Washington, DC, November 19, 2014.

Hon. ED WHITFIELD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WHITFIELD: At a hearing before the House Rules Committee earlier this week, you spoke in support of H.R. 4795, the Promoting New Manufacturing Act. In your testimony, you seemed to imply that the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA) favors passage of this legislation.

I am writing to clarify that NACAA has never expressed support for H.R. 4795. Although we appreciate the Committee's desire

to encourage the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to issue implementation guidance for new and revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in a timely manner, we do not believe that public health should be sacrificed in promoting that goal.

Many of our members are very concerned by the provision in Section 3 of the bill that would allow facilities seeking pre-construction permits to conduct air quality analyses based on outdated air quality standards, should EPA fail to issue implementation guidance concurrently with the promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS. They believe this would likely cause substantial adverse health impacts and undermine public confidence in permitting programs that were designed to protect public health. In addition, agencies have expressed concern that the bill could cause unnecessary regulatory uncertainty, as well as unfairly shift the burden of reducing emissions to existing facilities, where it is far less cost-effective to do so.

Accordingly, NACAA cannot support this legislation. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

S. WILLIAM BECKER.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 113–626 by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 225, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

AYES—183

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Campbell
Cassidy
Clay
Clyburn
Culberson
Dingell
Duckworth
Fincher
Fortenberry
Green, Al
Hall
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Richmond
Rush
Smith (WA)
Wagner

□ 1030

Mr. MEADOWS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 529 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 529, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4795) to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 756, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4795 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsections:

(d) PROTECTING CHILDREN AND SENIORS FROM EXPOSURE TO DANGEROUS AIR POLLUTANTS.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application if—

(1) the new or revised national ambient air quality standard protects children and seniors from exposure to dangerous air pollutants, including any air pollutant that causes cancer; and

(2) the preconstruction permit application is for a source that is located within 5 miles of a school, day care facility, hospital, or nursing home.

(e) PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND AMERICAN JOBS.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application for a source if subjecting the source to the existing national ambient air quality standard would result in higher costs or job losses for small businesses that—

(1) are subject to the new or revised national ambient air quality standard; and

(2) are located in the State or nonattainment area involved.

Ms. KUSTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree on the importance of revitalizing the American manufacturing sector. We need to work across the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to support manufacturing workers and businesses, so that more products across this planet can be stamped ''Made In America.'' That is why I am a proud supporter of the Make It In America agenda.

We need to pass this agenda which will help more businesses manufacture goods in America, so more families can make it in America. For example, we need to work with the Senate to permanently extend the research and development tax credit. This tax credit will help companies like Airmar in Milford, New Hampshire, a world leader in ultrasonic sensor technology.

We need to expand Trade Adjustment Assistance and invest in workforce development, like the $2.5 million Department of Labor grant recently awarded to Nashua Community College. This funding will help teach students the skills needed for advanced manufacturing careers, so that a graduate with a 2-year associate degree can leave school and walk into a good job that pays $45,000 a year.

We need to pass long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, to help companies like Boyle Energy in Concord, New Hampshire, ship American-made products around the world.

These are the policies that will promote new manufacturing jobs, and they deserve bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the bill before us today is not a commonsense bipartisan proposal for strengthening manufacturing; instead, it would tie the hands of our public health officials and make it harder to advance lifesaving rules to protect our air and our lungs from pollution.

That is why I am offering my motion, which would provide two exemptions from this bill. First, my motion would exempt rules that protect children and seniors from cancer-causing pollution within 5 miles of a school or nursing home, and second, my motion would protect small businesses from any job losses or increased costs resulting from this bill.

Whether you support or oppose the underlying bill, every Member of this body should be able to vote to protect the health of children and seniors and to protect small businesses.

I urge support for my motion. I urge my colleagues to move on from these partisan proposals and instead work to find bipartisan ways to strengthen American manufacturing without putting our air quality or public health at risk.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit because I strongly support American manufacturing, and that is what our bill is about. It is about getting Americans back to work.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle want to talk about protecting seniors. The biggest threat we hear about seniors right now is the President's health care law that cut hundreds of billions of dollars out of the Medicare program.

Why don't you work with us to repeal that law and replace it with reforms that actually strengthen Medicare and help seniors? That would be a really good place to start.

Now, let's talk about jobs, Mr. Speaker, because that is the focus of this bill, and this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. What we are trying to do is actually support some of the things the President himself has talked about.

The President said that he wants to cut red tape. Do you know what this bill does, Mr. Speaker? It cuts red tape.

The President says he wants to be the most transparent President ever. We would actually like to help him fulfill that promise. In our bill, we actually require transparency from the EPA to actually start proving what they are saying that they want to do with actual science.

If you look at what has been holding back our economy, so many States will tell you, when they are trying to issue permits, it is agencies like the EPA that are holding back their ability to create jobs and issue permits that would result in higher air quality standards.

Ironically, the motion to recommit that they are bringing forward would actually make it harder to implement higher air quality standards.

We have had testimony in committee, Mr. Speaker, from companies that have told us that they are right now delayed by years, in some cases, in the permitting process to build new or better plants to create thousands of jobs in America because the EPA will come up with rules and guidelines; yet they won't even show States or industry groups how they can achieve this in the real world.

There is this parallel universe, Mr. Speaker. You have got the EPA coming out time and time again with rules and regulations that cannot be implemented in the real world, and then you have got people that are trying to create jobs in America saying, ''The biggest thing holding us back from creating good American jobs is these crazy radical rules coming out by the EPA and other agencies like it.''

Mr. Speaker, we have got a choice to make, here in this Chamber and across this country. The President says he wants to create jobs; yet he comes out with rules with those agencies like the EPA that are the biggest impediment to us creating jobs in America.

The President says he wants to be transparent, and yet he refuses to be transparent, and a bill, like our bill here today, says he has to be transparent. Show us how you are expediting the permitting process. He talks about that. It is time to walk the walk.

He says he actually wants to remove that red tape. Well, do you know what, Mr. Speaker? In our bill, we hold the President to his promise by removing that red tape.

We ask ourselves today: Do we want to get our economy moving again? I say ''yes.'' Do we want to cut the red tape the President promises but doesn't deliver? I say, ''Yes. Let's cut that red tape.''

Do we want to get our economy moving again? I say, ''Let's create those jobs, get our economy moving again, and get these radical agencies that are slowing down job growth in our country out of the way.''

Let's vote down this motion to recommit, pass the underlying bipartisan bill, and get the economy moving again.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 223, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—189

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus
Campbell
Cassidy
Costa
Dingell
Duckworth
Fincher
Fortenberry
Gardner
Green, Al
Hall
Hinojosa
Holt
King (IA)
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
Poe (TX)
Richmond
Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1050

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 530 had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 172, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—172

Adams
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)

Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus
Campbell
Cassidy
Costa
DeSantis
Dingell
Duckworth
Fincher
Fortenberry
Gardner
Green, Al
Hall
Hinojosa
Holt
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
Poe (TX)
Richmond
Smith (WA)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1058

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 531, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes:

Waxman/McNerney Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4795. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

H.R. 4795—Promoting New Manufacturing Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during November 19–20, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Wednesday, November 19, 2014: rollcall No. 526, Kennedy of Massachusetts Part B Amendment No. 2—"yea;" rollcall No. 527, On motion to recommit with instructions—"yea;" rollcall No. 528, H.R. 4012 Secret Science Reform Act of 2014—"nay."

Thursday, November 20, 2014: rollcall No. 529, Waxman of California Part C Amendment No. 1—"yea;" rollcall No. 530, On motion to recommit with instructions—"yea;" rollcall No. 531, H.R. 4795 Promoting New Manufacturing Act—"nay."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5114

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor from H.R. 5114.

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

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS AT MARYSVILLE-PILCHUCK HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today with my colleagues from Washington State to ask you, at the end of my comments, to ask for a moment of silence because, on October 24, the Marysville, Washington, and Tulalip communities were violently ripped apart by a tragic shooting at Marysville-Pilchuck High School. Four students and their assailant have died, and one student was seriously wounded.

Now, as the father of two teenage boys, my heart breaks as I consider the families who were given the worst news imaginable as a result of this horrible event.

Healing is a difficult process, especially as we approach the Thanksgiving holiday. Marysville and Tulalip and the surrounding communities have shown their strength, however, and their resilience by celebrating these young people and giving thanks for their lives, although those lives were cut terribly short—the lives of Zoe Galasso, Gia Soriano, Shaylee Chuckulnaskit, Andrew Fryberg, and, yes, a celebration of even the life of the shooter, young Jaylen Fryberg.

Our thoughts are also with Nate Hatch and his family as he continues to recover.

We all want to thank our first responders and the Marysville-Pilchuck High School staff and leadership for their quick action on that sad day. We want to thank the Tulalip leadership for their resiliency and the faith communities throughout the area for opening their buildings and their arms to the grieving population. Everybody involved deserves our thanks and deserves our prayers.

For our first responders, you put yourselves at risk to keep our children safe, and I know I speak for our whole community when I thank you for your service and your bravery.

I want to commend the strength of the community leaders during this incredibly difficult time. And my colleagues and I want to continue to send thoughts and prayers to students, teachers, and families of the Marysville and Tulalip communities.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the House, and we all ask the House, to observe a moment of silence as we remember these young people whose lives ended far too soon.

IN MEMORY OF SERGEANT JEFF GREENE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in memory of Union County Sheriff's Deputy Sergeant Jeff Greene, who died yesterday in a tragic motor vehicle accident in Monroe, North Carolina.

Sergeant Greene was a 10-year veteran of the Sheriff's Office and managed the offices responsible for gun permits, for fingerprinting and the sex trafficking registry. He was also a veteran, having served honorably in both the United States Air Force and the United States Marines.

Sergeant Greene was a family man, and I would ask my colleagues to remember his wife, April, his daughters, Nicolle and Allison, and his five precious grandchildren in your prayers.

Sergeant Greene was committed to serving his community both as a law enforcement officer and as an active volunteer. He will be greatly missed.

May we honor all like Sergeant Greene and remember to pray daily for them, these brave men and women who faithfully work to protect our communities.

REMEMBERING BILL McCAMMON

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember retired Alameda County Fire Chief Bill McCammon, who passed away on October 13.

Bill lived to serve, and he served all who lived in Alameda County. He devoted his life to keeping our community, State, and Nation safe.

After serving the Dublin-San Ramon and San Leandro fire departments, Bill took over as the first fire chief of the