

we could all agree on here in Congress, and they will help businesses create the jobs that people need right way in our districts.

It's time we do what the people sent us here to do in Washington. It's time to pass a jobs bill here in the House of Representatives.

HONORING BARBARA MIKKELSEN

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize Barbara Mikkelsen, a very special woman and a hometown hero doing extraordinary work for our military veterans in Prescott, Arizona.

Barbara joined U.S.VETS in 2004 and has led their effort to provide affordable housing, quality health care, and job training to the homeless veterans of the Quad Cities of northern Arizona. Nationally, U.S.VETS feeds, clothes, shelters, and helps get back to work over 2,000 veterans every year.

As the Prescott site director for U.S.VETS, the largest service provider for homeless veterans in the United States, Barbara was awarded the 2011 national award for Site Director of the Year. Additionally, the Arizona Department of Veterans Services recognized Barb with an award of recognition and appreciation.

Barb has proven herself a dedicated and inspiring advocate. I applaud her for going above and beyond the call of duty. I congratulate her and am proud of the wonderful service to our military men and women in Arizona's First Congressional District. I challenge others to follow her exemplary leadership and give back to their community in this time of great national need.

SERVICEMEMBERS, MILITARY FAMILIES AND BUDGET CUTS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of our servicemembers and their families. For the last 10 years, our all-volunteer force has graciously and without complaint done all we have asked for them. They have deployed, many more than once, leaving their friends and families here at home to go fight on foreign soil.

And today, during this time of budget constraints and upcoming cuts, we must remember the sacrifice our service men and women, as well as their families, have made. We cannot balance our budget by cutting the benefits they have earned and deserve.

I agree that all aspects of government spending must be looked at and considered for possible cuts. In this era, where our budget is so out of balance, no one entity can be spared. However, we have to make smart cuts and

ensure that our fighting men and women are taken care of. We need to look at weapons programs that no longer meet our needs, redundancies that can be streamlined and other programs that should be more efficient.

I encourage my colleagues on the supercommittee to fight for our brave men and women by protecting the benefits they so rightly deserve.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2954

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, due to a clerical error, I was inadvertently made a cosponsor on the wrong bill. As such, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 2954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EPA REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2011

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous materials on H.R. 2250.

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 419 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. 2250.

□ 0916

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. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM 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 California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Since 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency has rolled out a long list of regulations that are really unprecedented in their cost and complexity. The impacts on jobs, energy prices, and America's industrial competitiveness in the world are extremely serious.

But of all these rules, the Boiler MACT rule, which we will be discussing today, stands out in that it will apply to a very wide variety of employers. Not only will industrial facilities be impacted, but also colleges, universities, hospitals, government buildings, and large commercial properties.

The impact on jobs projected is staggering, but the cost will be borne by all of us in the form of higher tuition costs, higher hospital bills, higher rent, as well as higher prices for manufactured goods. Just about everyone will be adversely impacted either directly or indirectly.

The good news is that we can reduce emissions from boilers without causing economic harm. The EPA Regulatory Relief Act, H.R. 2250, accomplishes this goal by taking a sensible, middle ground, balanced approach; and I would like at this time to thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina, as well as Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, for their sponsorship of this bipartisan bill.

A study conducted by IHS Global Insight, a respected research company, found that the rules that we are talking about today would impose total costs of over \$14 billion and put at risk 230,000 jobs in America at a time when we already have a 9.1 percent unemployment rate. My home State of Kentucky, under the analysis, would face estimated costs of \$183 million and 2,930 potential job losses. Twenty-five other States are hit even harder. That includes at least 10,000 jobs estimated for North Carolina, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia, as well as over 5,000 job losses for Minnesota, Wisconsin, Alabama, Tennessee, Iowa, New York, Illinois, Maine, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

□ 0920

These boiler rules largely target coal-fired boilers and thus discourage the use of this energy source which, by the way, today provides about 50 percent of all of the electricity produced in America.

I should add that the problems with EPA's boiler rules are not the sole fault of the agency. These rules, like many today, are being rushed out the door to comply with a court-ordered deadline. EPA asked for additional time, but their request was refused by the courts. EPA then published the rules by the deadline, but immediately announced that it was reconsidering portions of them because they were so complicated. However, this is not an adequate solution, as the reconsideration only applies to some of the many problematic provisions in these rules; and the reconsideration process is an uncertain one. In reality, it is unlikely that all the issues can be addressed.

So our legislation is to help EPA deal with this problem. We create a comprehensive solution not only for EPA but also for boiler owners, and we provide the certainty that this solution will be implemented. It still requires

additional emissions reductions from boilers, but it gives EPA the time it needs to do it right. It gives the regulated community the time it needs in order to comply.

This bill is supported by over 300 organizations and five national labor unions. It will require that the standards be reasonable and take into account cost and achievability under real-world conditions. I believe that EPA's original rules were a departure from the congressional intent in the Clean Air Act, and the EPA Regulatory Relief Act that we're discussing today represents a return to congressional intent.

Make no mistake, under this bill that we're discussing, new standards will be imposed on boiler owners and operators. The goals of the Clean Air Act can be accomplished without undue cost and job losses, particularly at this time when our Nation's economy is struggling, and the EPA Regulatory Relief Act is the way to do it.

So I would urge every Member of this body to come forth today and help us pass this legislation—help us save over 230,000 jobs at risk in America that we can ill-afford to lose—with this balanced approach to the problem.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today's debate is going to seem awfully familiar to anyone that's been paying attention. Today's debate will remind us of the bill we passed in April to block any requirements to control carbon pollution; and the bill we passed in June to loosen pollution controls on oil companies; and the bill we passed in September to gut the Clean Air Act and block pollution controls on power plants; and the bill we debated yesterday to ensure cement kilns don't have to clean up their toxic air pollution.

In total, the House has voted 146 times this Congress to block action to address climate change, to halt efforts to reduce air and water pollution, to undermine protections for public lands and coastal areas, and to weaken the protection of the environment in other ways. This is the most anti-environment Congress in history.

Today, the House continues its frontal assault on public health and the environment. The bill we consider today would nullify and indefinitely delay EPA's efforts to reduce toxic emissions from industrial boilers and waste incinerators.

If this bill is enacted, there will be more cases of cancer, birth defects, and brain damage. The ability of our children to think and learn will be impaired because of their exposure to mercury and other dangerous air pollutants.

In 1990, Congress adopted a bipartisan approach to protect the public from toxic substances. The law directed EPA to set standards requiring the use of Maximum Achievable Control Technology to control emissions of mer-

cury, arsenic, dioxin, PCBs, and other toxic emissions. This approach has worked well. Industrial emissions of carcinogens and other highly toxic chemicals have been reduced by 1.7 million tons each year.

EPA has reduced pollution from dozens of industrial sectors. More than 100 categories of sources have been required to cut their pollution, and this has delivered major public health benefits to the Nation.

But a few large source categories still have not been required to control toxic air pollution due to delays and litigation. Now that pollution controls are finally being required on industrial boilers and waste incinerators, this bill would intervene and delay pollution controls indefinitely. It would also rewrite the standard-setting provisions in the Clean Air Act to weaken the level of protection and set up new hurdles for EPA rules.

We're told that this bill simply gives EPA the time they requested to get the rules right. Well, the EPA has not requested this from Congress, and the President has said he'll veto this bill if it gets to his desk.

We're also told that we need to pass these bills because the threat of EPA regulation is dragging down our economy. The reality is that requiring installation of pollution controls will create jobs. Fabricators and factory workers build the pollution controls, construction workers install them on site, and industry employees operate them.

We'll hear over and over today, as we've heard in the past, about self-serving industry studies that claim pollution controls will cost us jobs. These studies have been thoroughly debunked by independent experts. For instance, the Congressional Research Service examined the key study by the Council of Industrial Boiler Owners and concluded that it was so flawed that "little credence can be placed in these estimates of job losses."

It's my hope this body will not be so easily misled. It was the lack of regulation of Wall Street banks that caused this recession, not environmental regulations that protect children from toxic mercury emissions.

I oppose these bills on the substance, but I also have concerns about the process as well. When Congress organized at the beginning of the year, the majority leader announced that the House would be following a discretionary CutGo rule. Similarly, Chairman UPTON on our committee stated that he'd be following that same discretionary CutGo rule. Well, CBO has determined that the bill we consider today authorizes new discretionary spending and will have significant impact on the Federal budget.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

However, this new authorization is not offset and the bill does not comply

with the Republican's discretionary CutGo policy. It is not discretionary in the sense that they have discretion whether to follow it or not, but discretionary spending when it is mandated in a bill must be paid for. The American people need to focus on the radical agenda of the Republicans that control the House of Representatives. I don't think when the Republicans were voted into office the American people wanted poisoning more children with mercury and letting more of our seniors die prematurely because of uncontrolled air pollution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2250.

I'm a cosponsor of this legislation which was introduced in response to yet another overreaching EPA rule proposal, this time for industrial boilers. This rule finalized will have devastating effects on the Nation's economy and lead to further job loss, especially in my home State of Ohio.

The community of Orrville, Ohio, which is east of me, a small city which has just over 8,300 residents, provides a perfect example of the wide-ranging negative impacts of the rule.

□ 0930

As written, the Boiler MACT rule would require Orrville Utilities, a non-profit electric service provider, to spend \$40.2 million on additional controls to remain in compliance. This equates to \$4,843 for every man, woman and child living in Orrville, as well as putting the utility workers' jobs at risk.

While that cost increase alone would be devastating to the families and job creators in the community, the unintended consequences reach much deeper. For example, Smucker's, that company that we all know and love which makes jellies, jams, apple butter, spreads and other food products has been a staple of America's homes for over 110 years; and it employs over 1,500 people at its home factories in Orrville. Smucker's has been a customer of Orrville Utilities since the establishment of the utility in 1917, and the company's CEO says "Smucker's has elected to remain in the Orrville, Ohio, community for many reasons, including the low rates, reliable service, and the company benefits of working with a city-owned and -operated electric utility."

It is impossible for me to understand why anyone would support a rule that would force a nonprofit utility like Orrville to significantly raise their rates, as the result of a rule EPA has admitted was based on faulty information, and make it more difficult for companies that have been providing thousands of jobs in communities like

Orrville for over 110 years to do business.

It is important to note that this bill does not ask the EPA not to regulate these facilities. It only lays out a framework that allows the EPA to regulate them in a more reasonable fashion, over a more reasonable time frame so we can protect the environment and take advantage of all the economic benefits that these facilities provide to the communities and businesses they service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important job-saving legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, before I recognize the subcommittee chairman, I want to indicate to the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke, Mr. LATTA, that he was giving a speech on the wrong rule, that this bill does not pertain to the rule that he mentioned in his comments.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment.

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank my leader, the ranking member of the full committee, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2250, the Dirty Boiler Enhancement and Enabler bill.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. This bill represents yet another Republican unrestrained, unrestricted assault on the Clean Air Act and on our Nation's most fundamental environmental protection laws. In fact, since the new Republican majority has taken over, there's been a constant assault against the Environmental Protection Agency and the clean air policies that they enforce on behalf of a few of the most avaricious, opportunistic, and dirtiest polluters ever known in the history of mankind and to the detriment of the American public as a whole.

Since the new Tea Party-led majority has taken control of this Congress, this body has passed bill after bill that will weaken our Nation's most basic clean air and clean water regulations. One of the very first bills that this new radical Republican majority passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, H.R. 910, was a direct frontal attack to the EPA's ability to even regulate greenhouse gas emissions at all, despite the warnings and evidence from those in the scientific community that these gases directly contribute to climate change.

Last month, the radical Republican majority followed that up with H.R. 2401, the TRAIN Wreck Act, which will repeal and block smog, soot, mercury and air toxics standards for power plants that will potentially save thousands of lives and avoid hundreds of thousands of asthma attacks in this Nation.

Now, here we are today debating H.R. 2250, the Dirty Boiler Enhancement and Enabler bill, which would vacate

three Clean Air Act rules that establish the only national limits on emissions of air toxics, including mercury, from certain boilers and incinerators. This bill would require EPA to propose and finalize weaker alternative rules that will allow for more pollution than the law currently permits by intentionally making substantial changes in how the EPA sets the standards for the rules.

At a minimum, this Dirty Boiler Enabler and Enhancement bill would delay EPA reductions from boilers and incinerators until at least 2018, which is a 3-year delay. Mr. Chairman, the science tells us that these dirty air toxics can cause a variety of serious health effects, including cancer, respiratory and neurological impairments, as well as reproductive problems. The research also tells us that low-income families and minorities are disproportionately affected by toxic air pollution, including impaired neurological development, as well as higher rates of respiratory and cardiovascular disease because these groups are more likely to live closer to industrial power plant facilities.

In fact, by the EPA's own estimate, H.R. 2250 will allow up to tens of thousands of additional premature deaths and heart attacks and hundreds of thousands of additional asthma attacks that could have been avoided.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, it is now time that the radical Republican majority stop putting profits in the pockets of dirty polluters and stop putting dirty air in the lungs of the American people. Now is the time for the Republicans to cease their unending assault on the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this egregious and dangerous bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to yield 4 minutes to the primary sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I rise today in support of H.R. 2250, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011.

Excessive regulations are threatening jobs across the Nation. We all recognize the need for reasonable regulations to protect the public. There are good regulations that ensure public safety and protect our environment. But there are also unnecessary and unreasonable regulations that hurt jobs in some of our Nation's most critical industries.

Recently, a representative from Celanese, a chemical company in the Ninth District of Virginia, which I'm proud to represent, testified that the EPA's Boiler MACT rules, as written, could force them to significantly scale back or change operations at a plant in Giles County that employs hundreds of

people in the Ninth District. Giles County and communities throughout southwest Virginia are already facing job losses resulting from other excessive EPA regulations.

The Boiler MACT rules are a very complex area of law and regulation. We are talking about hundreds of pages of rules in the Federal Register. These rules would affect boilers used by thousands of major employers and smaller employers, including hospitals, manufacturers, and even our colleges.

By the EPA's own estimates, compliance with its Boiler MACT rules will impose \$5.8 billion in upfront capital costs and impose new costs of \$2.2 billion annually. However, the Council of Industrial Boiler Owners estimates that the capital costs alone of the final rules will exceed \$14 billion and could put more than 230,000 jobs at risk, including 10,000 jobs in Virginia.

□ 0940

The EPA Regulatory Relief Act would provide the EPA with 15 months to repropose and finalize new, achievable, and workable rules to replace those that were published earlier this year. The legislation would extend the compliance deadlines from 3 to at least 5 years to allow facilities—like Celanese and others—enough time to comply with these very complex and expensive standards and to install the necessary equipment. It also directs the EPA to ensure that new rules are in fact achievable by real-world boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and directs the EPA to impose the least burdensome regulatory alternatives under the Clean Air Act, consistent with the act and President Obama's Executive order.

Despite what opponents may say, this bill recognizes the need for reasonable boiler regulations. This is not an attempt to forego the rules entirely. Under H.R. 2250, the EPA must issue replacement rules and must set compliance dates. The bill simply provides sufficient time for the government to get the rules right and come up with a more reasonable and achievable approach that protects the public without imposing unnecessary costs on businesses that employ thousands of hardworking Americans.

Protecting jobs is an issue that transcends party lines. This commonsense bill represents a compromise. Like any compromise, the language of H.R. 2250 is not what I might have done if I were acting alone. However, this bill brought together a group of legislators from both sides of the aisle with a reasonable approach and reasonable language. The EPA Regulatory Relief Act has 126 bipartisan cosponsors.

America's job creators are also speaking out in support of this bill. The EPA Regulatory Relief Act has received hundreds of support letters from businesses, unions, and trade associations. Understand, the investments required by these rules are irreversible. For those businesses that decide to

stop producing their product at a particular location, the job losses are also irreversible.

The good news here is excessive regulations are reversible and fixable. We must fix unreasonable regulations like the Boiler MACT rules and keep the focus on protecting valuable American jobs.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011. I appreciate this opportunity to carry this important legislation, which will protect jobs not only in the Ninth District of Virginia, but across these United States.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank our leader from California.

I just want to say that these bills represent a toxic assault that compromises public health for polluter wealth. Republicans are continuing their war on the environment with episode 37 of the Clean Air Act repeal-athon. It is a tried-and-true, three-part Republican strategy:

First, pass legislation that repeals regulations that have already been set. Second, indefinitely delay new regulations from ever being set. And third, just for good measure, include a provision that eviscerates the very underpinnings of effective Federal law and deters any effort to protect the health and well-being of millions of Americans.

Make no mistake, that is what we are doing here this week. These bills block and indefinitely delay implementation of the rules that would reduce hazardous air pollution, such as mercury, lead, and cancer-causing substances released from cement kilns and industrial boilers, and do so in callous disregard for adverse impacts those pollutants have on public health, particularly on the health of infants and children.

Republicans have decided to stage their own public event today on the floor: Occupy Stall Street. But lest you think that Republicans always want to delay regulations, it turns out that sometimes they want to speed up the wheels.

Republicans voted to tell EPA to hurry up and make decisions to issue air permits for drilling rigs off the pristine coast of Alaska. Republicans have voted to give the Department of the Interior a mere 30 days to approve permit applications for drilling in the gulf at the same time they block legislation to implement any drilling reform in the wake of the BP disaster. And they've also voted to reduce the time allowed for environmental review so that the State Department would approve the Keystone pipeline as soon as possible.

But when it comes to regulations that would decrease the amount of toxic pollutants in our air or water, apparently the same Federal agencies that evaluate hazardous pollutants in the first place just need more time to review the science, more time to understand the technologies, more time before doing anything to make our water safer to drink, make our air safer to breathe, and protect the health of children around the country.

And it also turns out that Republicans don't always turn a blind eye towards the health effects of toxic chemicals. Three months ago, as our country stood on the edge of default due to Tea Party brinksmanship, House Republicans chose to vigorously debate a bill to ban compact fluorescent light bulbs. During that debate, Republicans repeatedly told us that the mercury vapor from those light bulbs is dangerous and that exposing our citizens to the harmful effects of the mercury contained in CFL light bulbs is likely to pose a hazard for years to come. Yet the bills considered today would result in nearly 16,600 pounds of extra mercury vapors being released directly into the air, and that's just in 1 year. That is the equivalent of 2.5 billion compact fluorescent light bulbs. And the mercury released as a result of these bills is not the kind you can sweep off the living room floor or throw into a trash can. This is the mercury released directly into the air that we all breathe and finds its way into the food that we eat.

If the regulation to remove mercury from cement plants—which is already 13 years overdue—is delayed for even 1 year, up to 2,500 people will die prematurely, there will be 17,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1,500 people will suffer heart attacks.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

If the regulation to remove mercury, lead, and cancer-causing toxins from incinerators and industrial boilers—which is already 11 years overdue—is delayed for even 1 year, there will be 6,600 people who will die prematurely and people will miss 320,000 days of work and school.

The Republicans are presenting yet another false choice to the American people. We do not have to choose between manufacturing and mercury. We do not have to choose between concrete and cancer. We can have both clean air and a healthy manufacturing sector.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible Republican cancer-causing bill out here on the floor today.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might just note to the gentleman from Massachusetts that our legislation does not postpone this indefinitely. EPA has 15 months after passage of the bill to come out with the regulations and 5 years to comply. And the only way they can be

extended beyond 5 years is if the EPA administrator, herself, decides to do so.

At this time I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, a member of the committee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2250, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011.

□ 0950

This important legislation will greatly reduce the onerous regulatory burden caused by what is commonly referred to as Boiler MACT, the Boiler MACT rule that has been proposed by the EPA.

Furthermore, I commend the sponsors of the bill and fellow members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Chairman WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina, for their leadership on this important issue.

Unfortunately, the Boiler MACT rule has the potential to cost a broad base of industries a total of nearly \$14.4 billion in compliance costs, and it could jeopardize upwards of 225,000 jobs. In my home State of Georgia alone, the Boiler MACT rule would put nearly 6,400 jobs at risk. At a time when 14 million Americans are out of work, we need to take the necessary steps to prevent adding even more people to these unemployment rolls.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2250 would simply delay this rule by 15 months in order to insert much-needed common sense into this rulemaking process. By providing this important delay, there will be ample time for the EPA to craft rules that will take into account the economic impact of these regulations and to provide industries with the needed time for their implementation. This has the potential of creating more certainty in the marketplace than currently exists and will help spur economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, critics of this legislation will say that we are simply ignoring the Clean Air Act and risking irresponsible harm to our environment. Let me assure my colleagues that this argument is false. The intent of H.R. 2250 is not to completely repeal this environmental rule. The legislation seeks to correct the regulatory overreach by the EPA, especially in this depressed economy, and to reconfigure this rule so that it can be functional for industries and save much-needed jobs in the process.

So, Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge all my colleagues to please support H.R. 2250.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, I want to set the record straight. Our distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle said that this bill would provide 15 months to promulgate a rule and then 5 years to comply. There are 15 months to promulgate the rule, but there's no requirement that there ever be compliance.

I want to also point out that this argument about jobs being lost is absolutely wrong for four reasons, and four reasons you shouldn't believe them. First, the claims are based on fundamentally flawed studies, bought and paid for by the regulated industry.

Second, the rules are stayed. EPA is in the process of redoing them, and not one of these studies has analyzed the actual final rule.

Third, EPA has done a rigorous 251-page economic analysis, and found that the boiler rules issued in February would be expected to create over 2,000 jobs.

And finally, history tells us to be very, very skeptical of industry claims that the sky is falling. EPA is in the process of rewriting these rules. I say to the industry, let us work together to fashion legislation that will solve the immediate problems, a bill that can be signed by the President, not this bill, which may never see the light of day out of the Senate, and if it did, the President has indicated he would veto it.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW), a member of our committee.

Mr. BARROW. I thank the ranking member for the time to express another view on the legislation.

I'm proud to be an original sponsor of the EPA Regulatory Relief Act. This legislation was drafted in response to new EPA regulations on emissions from industrial boilers. I believe those regulations, however well meaning, cannot reasonably be met with today's technologies. I believe that this bill is a more reasonable solution than that proposed by the EPA.

The choice before us is not between the two mutually exclusive outcomes of dirty air or more jobs. Our challenge is to promote policies that serve both. I think this bill strikes a better balance. It will spur industry to make investments that cut down on harmful air emissions, while minimizing the chances of negative economic consequences and job losses.

I'm proud to have worked in a productive, bipartisan way to get this bill to the floor, and encourage my colleagues' support.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), who's chairman of the Science Committee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, Chairman WHITFIELD, of course I rise in support of H.R. 2250.

As policymakers, it's our job to use common sense and judgment to balance the universal priorities of a strong economy, security at home and security abroad, and healthy communities. And this country has a history of remarkable achievement in addressing these priorities. However, with an unemployment rate of more than 9 percent, it's irresponsible for the executive branch to stifle job growth and, for that matter, to create job loss through

the outrageous and inflexible negotiations and regulations.

In my district alone, the Boiler MACT rules threaten more than 800 good-paying manufacturing jobs. These are not jobs that can be re-created. Once eliminated, they're gone. Several weeks ago Assistant Administrator Gina McCarthy stated arrogantly, I don't want to create the impression that EPA is in the business of creating jobs.

I feel that statement's inappropriate and unfeeling toward those who have lost their jobs and lost the ability to provide for their family's future. H.R. 2250 is a clear statement by Congress that EPA slow down and allow for reasoning along with some regulations.

The President said that his administration would be the most transparent in history. Instead, we find clandestine models, cherry-picking of data, double-counting of benefits, and a failure to follow basic peer review guidelines. This is a recipe for losing the public's trust. EPA needs a timeout, and this bill provides it.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, can you inform us as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, a rigorous peer-reviewed analysis, called "The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act from 1990 to 2020," conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency, found that the air quality improvements under the Clean Air Act will save \$2 trillion by 2020, and prevent at least 230,000 deaths annually—230,000 lives saved on an annual basis. We could save four times the number of people killed each year in automobile accidents by reducing air pollution.

Yet, just 2 weeks ago, this Chamber approved legislation to block the EPA from implementing rules to clean up the single largest stationary source of air pollution. That legislation gave this Nation's oldest and dirtiest coal-fired power plants another pass to pollute and avoid compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Today we're considering legislation, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act, to exempt the second-largest source of hazardous air pollution: Industrial and commercial boilers, process heaters, and commercial and industrial solid waste incinerators.

Under this bill, these large boilers and incinerators would be given at least a 75-month pass from regulation; a 15-month delay before any new rules could be issued, and an additional 5 years beyond that delay before any new emission standards could be issued; and

no deadline for industry compliance. This bill does more than just offer a pass from regulation. It also ensures that any final regulation will be weaker than what the law requires.

The final section of this bill deals with the Clean Air Act's most protective legal standard for reducing toxic air pollution, the Maximum Available Control Technology. After 20 years, we're replacing it with the absolutely least protective of measures, called "work practice standards" such as equipment tuneups that need not even reduce emissions.

Pass this bill and you sentence hundreds of thousands to asthma attacks and a lifetime of health complications. Pass this bill and you saddle our economy with unnecessary costs and employers with millions of additional sick days. Pass this bill and you trigger an additional 20,000 heart attacks. Pass this bill and you condemn tens of thousands of Americans to a premature death.

□ 1000

Mr. Chairman, the Cement Sector Regulatory Relief Act that unfortunately will pass today and the TRAIN Act that passed 2 weeks ago constitute an all-out war between this Nation's dirtiest industries and the Federal agency charged with protecting the public's health. EPA has become the symbol, the center, of a debate over the role of government. It's a sad commentary for this Chamber that an industry that prefers to invest in the political process rather than in saving lives by reducing harmful emissions is in fact winning the debate.

In fact, the coal consuming industries that have underwritten this assault on EPA were invited early on during the first year of the Obama administration to sit down and craft a compliance option. The administration had hoped to craft a deal similar to the historic deal it made with the Nation's auto industry on fuel efficiency and tailpipe emissions. An article by Coral Davenport in the September 22 issue of the National Journal referenced this meeting. But unlike the auto industry, the coal consuming industries refused to negotiate.

Instead, and let me quote from the article, they "banded together with the Republican Party to strategize, and the 2010 midterm elections offered the perfect battleground. The companies invested heavily in campaigns to elect Tea Party candidates crusading against the role of Big Government. Industry groups (like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce), Tea Party groups with deep ties to polluters (like Americans for Prosperity), and so-called super PACs (like Karl Rove's American Crossroads) spent record amounts to help elect the new House Republican majority."

My colleagues, this is a bill peddled by an industry that refuses to clean up

its act. Hundreds of thousands of people owe their lives today to the environmental movement, leaders in Congress, and the White House who pushed for and passed the landmark environmental laws back in the 1970s that required polluters to clean our waters and reduce the pollution in the air we breathe.

In the decade after the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments were signed into law by the first President Bush, our unemployment rate declined, our economy grew, and we reduced acid rain-forming gases by more than 30 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the cost of meeting the emission reductions was actually 75 percent less than what EPA had originally predicted and even farther below what opponents had claimed. In the case of the rule for boilers and solid waste incinerators, EPA issued its proposed standards in April of this year, 11 years after the statutory deadline. They listened to affected businesses, they cut compliance costs by a half and issued a modified, final rule in February.

Mr. Chairman, EPA is doing everything the law requires and that the public health requires. This body ought to do the same and defeat this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished lady from Washington State (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I appreciate his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2250, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011. At a time when our Nation's economy continues to struggle and unemployment remains far too high, Congress should focus on legislation that will keep and create jobs in America, not suffocate them or send them overseas. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I know it will do just that.

Last week, I was home in eastern Washington on an energy and jobs tour where I met with citizens, small businesses, and job creators. Whether I was up in Colville or in Spokane, the message was clear: The Federal Government is making it harder to manufacture, harder to produce, and harder to innovate anything in America. The anxiety and the uncertainty caused by the Federal Government's record regulatory overreach is destroying any chance of economic recovery.

Like the ozone standard, the simple truth is the new, stricter Boiler MACT regulations will have a disastrous effect on our economy. The EPA, itself, says that these rules will cost thousands of jobs. Independent studies say up to 224,000 jobs could be lost. One example is in eastern Washington, where the Ponderay Newsprint Company will

be forced to spend \$8 million on mandatory upgrades. That's \$8 million that cannot be spent on retaining or creating jobs.

The EPA Regulatory Relief Act requires the EPA to set realistic, achievable, fact-based standards that will not destroy jobs while still protecting the environment. I urge my colleagues to support this pragmatic, commonsense solution.

I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, a number of very passionate and well-informed speakers have come before this body today to urge a "no" vote based on facts and based on research. All this is extremely important, and I'm so glad they did it, but for the people watching this debate today, they need to know one thing, and that is that this legislation is bought and paid for by industry so that people could try to save money at the expense of people's health and their lives, and this is exactly what's going on here today.

What's going on here today is that industry interests backed candidates who come here today to offer legislation that would allow the cement industry, the coal-fired power industry and the boiler industry users to just dump mercury and other junk into the air that makes you sick.

And as we're talking about jobs, what about a jobs bill that could put Americans to work, as opposed to saying, we're just going to get rid of all the regulations in America? What if we just got rid of all the regulations in America? We would be sicker, we would die sooner, and we would be much less of a country. What if we just said that we're going to put the health of Americans up front, that we're going to actually introduce a jobs bill like the American Jobs Act? What if we did those things? America would be back on track. But maybe some of these big industrial polluters would be a little sadder.

I say today, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress should reject the attack on Americans' health. In the last 3 weeks, we have seen industry polluters from the industry that uses these boilers, the cement industry and coal-fired power plant industry, be able to just run amok on the people's health, and we have yet to see a single jobs bill in the course of the 250-plus days that this majority has been in the hands of the Republicans.

This is a national disgrace. The American people said they wanted jobs. They haven't gotten them. The American people say they want to be well and healthy. They are seeing assaults on that. This is something that the American people need to bring their attention to, Mr. Chairman; and I hope that people are paying attention to

this debate today because it is crystal clear whose side the majority is so on: industry polluters, not the American people.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, I don't know exactly what he's talking about when he says "bought and paid for by industry." I might say that this legislation is being offered because hospitals, schools, industry, a wide range of interests, have come to us and asked for help, and the insinuation that we were bought and paid for by industry is a little bit of an affront to this institution.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, President Obama's regulatory agenda, being led by the EPA, is going to kill the American pulp and paper industry. My father spent his entire career in the pulp and paper industry, so I know firsthand that if the misguided Boiler MACT rules are allowed to be implemented, 36 mills across this country will close and more than 80,000 jobs will be lost. These jobs will be lost because of the EPA's failure to understand the basics of how this industry works.

□ 1010

The industry does not—does not—impose reasonable regulations. They are just asking to have regulations based on sound science, which can be achieved with technology that is currently available here in the real world.

Mr. Chairman, we need to stop exporting American manufacturing jobs. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2250, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011, to create an immediate positive impact on American jobs and the recovery of our economy.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

What we have here today is just one more episode in what is a 1-year Republican control of the Congress, which has seen a litany of industries that no longer want to make the air cleaner, that no longer want to make the water safer to drink.

We come out here on the House floor with Republican leadership in order to repeal the laws, to water down the laws to protect children from mercury, to protect children from contracting asthma. That's what this is all about. The EPA used to stand for the Environmental Protection Agency. Now it stands for "every polluter's ally" out here. They all come out here, and they want to ensure that the laws are watered down.

That's what we're fighting. That's what Democrats are fighting here. We're fighting to ensure that the water stays clean, that the air stays safe to breathe. The boiler industry is saying, no, there's not enough mercury that gets sent up into the air; there's not

enough mercury that goes into the lives of children in our country. We're going to fight that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is a large number of Democrats on this legislation.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2250, which will protect American jobs from the EPA's unnecessary and economically destructive Boiler MACT regulations. At this time of high unemployment and economic hardship, the EPA wants to require the costly retrofitting of boilers at small businesses, energy plants, schools, and churches in the northern California congressional district I represent and across the Nation.

This regulation is another example of the Obama administration standing in the way of job growth. The Department of Commerce estimates that the 276 pages of Federal regulations could eliminate as many as 60,000 U.S. jobs nationwide. The EPA's own fact sheet says that implementing these rules will cost more than \$5 billion.

In August of 2010, the Small Business Administration explicitly warned the EPA that these regulations were too extreme and would harm small businesses. Unfortunately, the EPA did not heed this warning. In addition, the boiler regulation will impose substantial and unnecessary costs for Americans to use biomass energy—an essential part of job growth in the northern California district I represent. Biomass is a clean and renewable energy source that could help increase our energy supplies and manage our overgrown and fire-prone forests while creating much needed jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which will protect jobs and ensure that this costly regulation does not go into effect.

Mr. MARKEY. I would ask the Chair if we could review again how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1¼ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Kentucky has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in support of this legislation. We cannot afford to enforce the proposed MACT regulations, especially when unemployment exceeds 9 percent. These new burdensome regulations would result in the loss of over 200,000 jobs, over 8,400 of which are in Tennessee.

When will this administration learn that further burdening the job creators does not create jobs?

This is just another example of failed leadership, and it is our duty to the American people to ensure that the EPA does not continue down the same path that will only lead to job loss.

The new rules affect approximately 200,000 boilers. These boilers burn natural gas, fuel oil, coal, biomass, refinery gas, or other gas to produce steam, which is used to generate electricity or to provide heat for factories and other industrial or institutional facilities or schools.

This will especially affect the economic outlook in the agriculture community. Agriculture accounts for more than 950,000 jobs both on and off the farm—a large portion of the American economy. In Tennessee, 13.8 percent of the workforce is employed in agriculture, and these are jobs we cannot afford to lose to government overreach. If forced to replace current coal-fired boilers with natural gas-fired boilers at this time, there is no doubt that the cornerstone of our economy would suffer.

Or consider Eastman Chemical, a manufacturing company headquartered in my district. Eastman generates \$6.9 billion in revenue and employs over 11,000 Tennesseans. There is no doubt these new regulations would negatively impact their business, the effects of which they estimate for their company alone would be in the tens of millions of dollars. In fact, the Boiler MACT regulations could cost the manufacturing sector over \$14 billion in capital, plus billions more in annual operating costs; and complying with the incinerator standards could cost even billions more.

As the EPA has acknowledged, the rules were finalized with serious flaws because the EPA was forced to meet a strict court-ordered deadline. This commonsense legislation does not repeal these rules; it simply allows time to come up with a plan to support clean air efforts without more burdensome regulations on job creators.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding. I really want to thank him for bringing this jobs bill to the House floor.

This legislation, this EPA regulatory reform bill, is critical to saving tens of thousands of jobs—over 100,000 jobs—in America that are at risk if the EPA is able to get away with yet another radical regulation they're trying to implement.

When I go throughout southeast Louisiana and talk to job creators, our small business owners—the people who are struggling in this tough economy but who still want to try to create jobs—and when I ask them, What are the things that are holding you back

from creating jobs, from having your business grow so that more people can have great opportunities to live the American Dream?, there is a consistent theme that they all say, that it's the regulations coming out of Washington, D.C., coming out of the Obama administration. That is the prime reason that is holding them back from creating good jobs in this country.

Of course, we've seen it in southeast Louisiana—we've got tough times—but if you go all throughout the country, you'll see the same thing. Just look at the numbers from outside groups that have actually tried to figure out just how devastating the impact would be of just this boiler regulation if it were to go into effect by the EPA. Over 1,500 boilers across this country are at risk, and you're talking about over 230,000 jobs. Just look at some of the States—I mean, the State of North Carolina, the State of Indiana, the States of Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania. Each of those States will lose over 10,000 jobs if this radical EPA regulation goes into effect.

The President is running around the country, saying, Pass this bill. He was saying pass this bill before he even filed the bill. Here is an actual bill on the floor of the House of Representatives that will save over 230,000 jobs that will be lost; yet the President wants to ram through this radical regulation anyway in spite of the fact that all those jobs will be lost.

□ 1020

I think the American people understand what's going on. They're saying sanity needs to be reinvented in Washington in this administration.

Stop running jobs out of the country. Let's put commonsense reforms in place. This bipartisan legislation does that.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I would like to quote Bruce Bartlett, who was the economics adviser to both President Ronald Reagan and President George H. W. Bush. He said this in an article in *The New York Times* this week.

“Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them. The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that would be likely to lead to further layoffs at all levels of government. Republicans favor tax cuts for the wealthy and corporations, but these had no stimulative effect during the George W. Bush administration and there is no reason to believe that more of them will have any today. And the Republicans' oft-stated concern for the deficit makes tax cuts a hard sell. On August 29, the House majority leader, ERIC CANTOR of Virginia, sent a memorandum to members

of the House Republican Conference, telling them to make the repeal of job-destroying regulations the key point in the Republican jobs agenda. Evidence supporting Mr. CANTOR's contention that deregulation would increase unemployment is very weak. As one can see, the number of layoffs nationwide caused by government regulation is minuscule and shows no evidence of getting worse during the Obama administration."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I ask how much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

I come from central and northern Wisconsin where we have a large forest products industry. We make a lot of paper in Wisconsin. And if you look at these rules, they are going to have a significant impact on Wisconsin paper, real jobs that support our families. Domtar Industries, 1,400 jobs; Flambeau River Paper, 300 jobs; New Page, 3,200 jobs; Wausau Paper, 1,600 jobs.

So we look at these regulations that are going to increase the standard on our boilers. And if you increase those standards, causing our companies to spend millions of more dollars to meet those standards, what's going to happen? You are going to ship Wisconsin paper to China and Brazil. And what happens there? They don't have the same standards that we have. And, in the end, what's going to happen is we're going to outsource Wisconsin jobs and our paper is going to be made with reduced standards.

I think in the end, those who care about our environment, who care about standards to make sure we have clean water and clean air, if you look over to China, they don't have those same standards. But, in the end, we breathe the same air and drink the same water.

So let's make sure we have efficient standards that can keep American industry and Wisconsin paper in business and doesn't shift these jobs overseas.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Republicans have yet to bring a job creation bill out here on the House floor in the 10 months they have controlled the Congress.

Instead, what they're doing is responding to industries who do not want to make the air cleaner, who do not want to make the water safer for the children of our country to drink and to breathe. And, instead, they make the case that making the environment cleaner kills jobs when we know that all evidence says it creates more jobs, because it spurs innovation in new technologies that create jobs that make our economy stronger. Instead,

they argue that what the country needs is more mercury, more arsenic, more cadmium, more asthmas, more mercury poisoning, more carcinogens that harm the health of our country.

So not only do they not help the health of our economy by bringing out a jobs bill, instead they bring out bills that hurt the health of the American people where they live and their families. That's what their agenda has been all about since the day they took over in January, and that's the agenda that we are voting on here today.

Vote "no" on this Republican health-killing bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. In closing, I would urge every Member of this body to support H.R. 2250. We believe that it is genuinely a balanced approach. EPA even was trying to convince the court that their rule was a good rule, the old rule.

To just give you a very concrete example of this, of the practical impacts of what's going on here, EPA went to the court last December when it asked for time to fix the Boiler MACT rules, which the court denied it, and pointed out that the investments required by industry are irreversible.

An example of that, representatives of Notre Dame University came to our hearing. And in order to comply with the Boiler MACT rules issued in 2004, which were invalidated by the court, the University of Notre Dame spent \$20 million, and now they're not in compliance with the new rule, so they're going to have to come forth with additional millions of dollars.

So that's happening not only at the University of Notre Dame, that's happening at just about every university around the country, hospitals around the country, small businesses around the country, small utilities around the country. So if we don't take some action, there are going to be a lot less, many fewer jobs in the economy than there are today, because testimony after testimony after testimony has indicated that entities cannot meet these new rules, are going to have to close down and lose jobs.

So one way that we can help the administration create jobs is to prevent the loss of jobs. If this administration would assert more common sense in their rules, we could remove some of the uncertainty to help us create more jobs in America.

I would urge every Member to support 2250. It's a balanced approach. It protects health, protects industry, and provides a more commonsense approach to this significant problem.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia) having assumed

the chair, Mr. DENHAM, 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. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CEMENT SECTOR REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 419 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2681.

□ 1030

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2681) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for cement manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 5, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) 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 172, noes 248,