

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ALASKA REMOTE GENERATOR RELIABILITY AND PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1934) to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1934

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 “Alaska Remote Generator Reliability and Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF REGULATIONS REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall revise section 60.4216(c) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), by striking “that was not certified” and all that follows through “compared to engine-out emissions” and inserting “must have that engine certified as meeting at least Tier 3 PM standards”.

(b) EMISSIONS AND ENERGY RELIABILITY STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report assessing options for the Federal Government to assist remote areas in the State of Alaska in meeting the energy needs of those areas in an affordable and reliable manner using—

- (1) existing emissions control technology; or
- (2) other technology that achieves emissions reductions similar to the technology described in paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a targeted exemption for remote villages in Alaska from EPA’s most recent emissions rules on diesel generators.

EPA and State officials have found that diesel generators compliant with the most recent standards do not work

reliably in harsh, cold winter conditions. To preserve the health and safety of the people relying on diesel generators, these are less strict but actually workable standards.

Our colleagues in the Senate passed this bill with unanimous consent. It is reasonable legislation that deserves our support.

I see Senators WHITEHOUSE and CARPER were supportive of this bill. It comes out of the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 1934, which would roll back public health standards under the Clean Air Act for dirty diesel generating units in remote areas of Alaska.

This legislation would undermine protections for human health, protections for the environment, and protections for our climate.

Adding insult to injury, this bill is being brought up under suspension of the rules at the last minute, over the objections of Democrats.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce, which has jurisdiction over the Clean Air Act and where I serve as the Environment Subcommittee ranking member, held no hearings on this subject nor considered any legislation relating to this matter.

EPA already gives special considerations for diesel generators in remote areas of Alaska. These special considerations allow remote areas to use stationary diesel generators that are certified to marine engine standards rather than more stringent land-based, nonroad engines.

However, all diesel generators in these areas that are model year 2014 or later, and not for emergency use, must be certified to meet EPA’s tier 4 emission standards. If they cannot meet tier 4 standards, then they must meet certain alternative requirements for particulate matter or install an emission control device that reduces PM emissions.

S. 1934 directs the EPA Administrator to revise downward the existing New Source Performance Standards for diesel generators, so that these units would have to meet only EPA’s tier 3 standards rather than the more protective tier 4 criteria.

Certainly, it is legitimate for Congress to consider assisting these remote areas with unique power needs and pollution problems. However, we should be looking to help these areas obtain cleaner, healthier air, not rolling back standards and pretending that the pollution and associated health and environmental problems don’t exist.

Further, I note that the bill directs the EPA, in consultation with the Department of Energy, to submit a report assessing options for the Federal Government to meet the energy needs of remote areas in the State of Alaska in

an affordable and reliable manner while addressing air emissions. That study is the right first step, and I would be happy to support it and then work with my colleagues to find ways to help these areas, based on the results of that particular study.

Unfortunately, this bill takes the backward approach of rolling back standards and then studying the problem. Perhaps if our Republican colleagues had come to us sooner than this week, we might have been able to find a way to come together on legislation.

Unfortunately, Republicans have chosen to take this up without consultation, at the last minute, over our objections. They have left us no option other than to fight. I wish it were otherwise.

For the past 2 years, the Trump administration has engaged in a consistent effort to undermine the Clean Air Act and its protections for everything from mercury and hazardous air pollutants to smog and particulate matter.

We have seen the Trump administration walk away from the Paris climate agreement, undo the Clean Power Plan, and gut fuel economy and greenhouse gas standards for motor vehicles. We must continue to stand firm against these actions that endanger public health, our continued economic well-being, and most certainly our planet.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge my colleagues to stand up for our public health, for our climate, and against those continued rollbacks of our Nation’s most successful environmental statute, the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote a strong “no” on S. 1934, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the only House Member from Alaska and the dean of the House.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this up.

This is not a Trump bill. This is a bill that affects one area: Alaska. This bill was asked for by the people who live in Alaska, not New Yorkers, by people who need power, that have not had power. It has been put in, in the past, they can’t meet these standards imposed by the EPA. It doesn’t work in the cold climate. They do not have the money to buy new generators.

Some say we have to protect their health. The gentleman from New York is going to shut down the clinics, the schools, and individual homes that cannot be heated, because there will be no electricity. There are no roads.

I am talking about small villages, 60 people, 25 people. They all have generators now that are outdated, but that is the only thing they can afford.

You know, we hear a lot from that side of the aisle, and sometimes this

side, about how we are protecting the people. Well, let's see how you are protecting them when they don't have healthcare, and they don't have schools. You really are helping them out.

As usual, the other side of this aisle, unfortunately, stands on this House floor and says what is best for people when they haven't the slightest idea.

You know, I don't wish bad luck on anybody, but maybe we want to have a blackout in New York and see how you would feel in a snowstorm. Maybe we would have some people understand that you are affecting people's lives directly by not supporting this bill.

This is a Senate bill that passed unanimously, supported by TOM CARPER, supported by ED MARKEY, supported by, I think, every Senator. It doesn't have opposition on the House floor.

Unfortunately, this is under suspension, and you will probably have enough votes to defeat this bill. Go home and feel good, say: I did the Lord's work. I kept the air clean. I protected the people.

And you are full of it, really full of it. You are hurting the people, hurting my Alaskans, my rural Alaskans.

I stand on this floor and watch this time and time again. Why would you oppose something that is going to help people? Impose an unfunded mandate on these villages is what, very frankly, the EPA has done.

The new ones, I might see, but the ones that are established there, I would suggest, respectfully, we ought to let them use that, so they could have heat in their houses, not air-conditioning. They can keep their food frozen. They can have their clinics take care of their people. And their schools can stay open.

These rural communities of my Alaska Natives, that is who you are hurting.

I hear it all the time: We are going to help the impoverished. We are going to help the poor.

You are not helping them. You are hurting them.

When you go to sleep tonight in your nice, warm house, and you fly in your nice plane, and you get in your nice car and feel good about helping the poor people, I say you are hurting them.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, just to help clarify the argument, obviously, I have a few questions.

Define an isolated village.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. A village has, probably, no roads, only an airport, small, fuel has to be shipped in by air or by boat.

Mr. SHIMKUS. How long would that flight be?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It depends. In some areas, it is 3 hours, and you are having to fly in the fuel.

They have had this generator. They had enough money to buy it maybe 10,

15 years ago, and now they will have to put on a so-called air cleaner. They don't have the knowledge to run it, and it doesn't work.

Mr. SHIMKUS. How many people are in an isolated village?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Oh, 25, 50, 100. My village that I live in has got 550. That is all.

To give you an idea, if the gentleman would yield to me for a second: If you took Alaska, all the land east of the Mississippi River, to the Atlantic Ocean, to the tip of Maine, to the tip of Florida, that is part of Alaska. In that area that I am talking about, Maine to Florida, there are 253 Congressmen and 52 Senators. Think about that.

□ 1130

Think about that. Why I say that, there are no roads, and you are going to punish those people who finally got enough money to buy an older generator by the EPA, an unfunded mandate, and say you are helping them.

Mr. SHIMKUS. If the gentleman will continue to yield for a last question, I hear that these new generators cost around \$66,000 to \$75,000?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. More than that. Usually, in that area, probably about \$150,000, if.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So if you have 60 people, that is \$1,000 each.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. By the way, there is no income. This is a poverty subsistence-style life.

They do have a school trying to improve their lot. They do have a clinic trying to help their health. But you are going take the power away because you want to keep the air pure?

Shame on you.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I respect and I share the gentleman's concern for the people of Alaska. I am talking about a bill that is drafted incorrectly. While it may be specific to Alaska, it is not specific to remote areas.

So we can share compassion for the people. I am just saying, if we had done this in regular order and exchanged dialogue with one another, perhaps the outcome would have been stronger.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I spent about a year in Alaska going to college, have been back a number of times, and it is, as the gentleman from Alaska describes, a very unique area. It is unlike anywhere else in America.

When you get out into these remote villages, you may fly in in a small Cessna airplane, land on a gravel strip, as I have done, and get out, and there

may only be 25 or 50 people there. That is it.

By the way, in the winter, it can be—what?—50, 60 below. I have seen that. And I have seen it in spring at break where we had to try to take off three different times on a runway because it had begun to soften up. The snow had begun to soften up, and we had to get out of the plane, turn it around, get back in. Eventually, we had to leave one guy behind in order to get off the ground. This is a very unique place.

The poverty that the gentleman from Alaska describes is very real. So, yes, of course, I wish we had had more time to work this out.

And to my colleague from New York, he and I have worked out most of these things along the way quite well. This bill came to us late, and, frankly, we didn't have time to deal with all of the finite pieces. Perhaps we could go back in the next session and do that, but this is before us today. The problem is before us today.

I believe this is a reasonable solution and that we should pass it. So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to approve this bill and send it to the President. I commit to work to make it even better next year.

I won't be the chairman, I understand that, but Mr. TONKO, Mr. Speaker, will be, I think, the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, and I would work with him and the gentleman from Alaska.

But this is the time, as we know, when things finally get done, and they may not be perfect, but in this case, I would err on the side of passing this bill and then fine-tweak it later if we have to.

This is a real serious issue in these tiny, remote, impoverished villages. I would defer to the gentleman from Alaska, who knows it better than any of us, and encourage passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay tribute, in closing, to our chief counsel on the committee, Karen Christian, who will be leaving us at the end of this Congress. She has been a remarkable member of the staff, engaged in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee for years, doing incredible work, and is going off to greener pastures.

After 13 years in the committee, I just want to say to Karen: Thank you for your service. Thank you for your leadership. We are going to miss you. Good luck to you and your family.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I'm convinced we have the best members in Congress and the best staff. In her thirteen years with the Committee, Karen Christian has been one of our finest. At the end of this Congress, Karen will move on, and while we are sad to see her go, we wish her well.

Karen joined the Committee in 2006 as a counsel on our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. She's served as both the deputy chief counsel and chief counsel of that subcommittee, and for the last four years she

has served as general counsel of the Committee.

As deputy chief counsel, Karen led several major Committee investigations, including investigations into the Department of Energy's management of the Loan Guarantee Program, including a failed loan guarantee to Solyndra; the stimulus bill, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act; cyber security and critical infrastructure, including an investigation of Huawei Technologies; and the Federal Communications Commission's handling of a license application from LightSquared.

As chief counsel, she led the Committee's investigations into General Motors ignition switch safety failures; the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, including the failure of HealthCare.gov; the fungal meningitis outbreak due to contaminated drugs; mental health care and treatment, including federal programs related mental health and serious mental illness; the opioid addiction epidemic; and the Environmental Protection Agency's consideration of carbon capture technologies in developing greenhouse gas emissions standards for new power plants.

And as general counsel, Karen has been responsible for overseeing and managing the legislative process for the entire Committee—that includes a 27-hour, marathon markup in March 2017 and regularly battling to preserve the Committee's jurisdiction.

By every measure, Karen's time at the Committee has been a complete success. While we are sad to lose our friend, we look forward to seeing her next accomplishments.

Karen, we wish you and your family—Dave, Christian, Andrew, and Charlotte the very best. We thank you for your service, your hard work, your guidance, and most of all your friendship. Your work made a difference . . . America is better because of your efforts.

Thank you and remember—at Energy and Commerce, the fun never stops.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, to Karen, from this side of the aisle, I wish her well, too. It was enjoyable working with her, and I look forward to working with the Members of the other side of the aisle in the 116th Congress on this issue and others.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, so I will close saying that I am concerned about the loosely defined language in this bill. I am concerned about the attacks on the Clean Air Act that are so important to all Americans.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I will just continue to respond to what the chairman said.

I think if we are going to err, we ought to err on the health and safety of Alaskans. I hope my colleagues will join us. I look forward to working with them in the next Congress?

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 1934, a bill that would roll back standards under the Clean Air Act (CAA) for diesel generating units in "remote areas" of Alaska. I understand the motivation behind this bill, but it could set a precedent for weakening existing New Source Performance Standards for diesel generators not just in Alaska, but across the United States.

I am committed to finding ways to help Alaskans in remote areas have affordable electricity while maintain health protections. Congress should tackle this issue with an open debate through regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1934.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NATHANIEL P. REED HOBE SOUND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3456) to redesignate Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge as the Nathaniel P. Reed Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3456

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION OF THE HOBE SOUND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge, located in the State of Florida, is redesignated as the "Nathaniel P. Reed Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any statute, rule, regulation, Executive order, publication, map, paper, or other document of the United States to the Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge is deemed to refer to the Nathaniel P. Reed Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 3456 would rename the Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge, located in southeast Florida, after Nathaniel P. Reed, who passed away on July 11, 2018, at the age of 84.

Nathaniel P. Reed was a prominent conservationist who served as an As-

sistant Secretary of the Interior from 1971 to 1977 and later returned to Florida to form an advocacy group to help preserve and restore the Everglades. He also joined forces with former Senator Bob Graham to launch the Florida Conservation Coalition.

Renaming the Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge, which is located near his home in Florida, in honor of Nathaniel P. Reed is a tribute to his legacy of conservation and public land stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill redesignates the Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge in southern Florida as Nathaniel P. Reed Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge.

We concur with the gentleman, the majority, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, on this issue. I ask all Members to please vote in favor of the resolution. It is a fitting tribute to a former Interior Department official who helped develop the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act. It is a fitting tribute, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3456.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SPACE FRONTIER ACT OF 2019

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3277) to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commercial space activities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3277

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Space Frontier Act of 2019".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—STREAMLINING OVERSIGHT OF LAUNCH AND REENTRY ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Office of Commercial Space Transportation.