

world. This is why it is fitting that, when Kevin Barry's Irish Pub opened in Savannah in 1980, it was the first Irish pub south of Washington, D.C., to offer live music 7 days a week.

With its live Irish music, cozy interior, topnotch customer service, and quality food, it quickly became a mainstay. In 2016, Kevin Barry's even won an award for being the most authentic Irish pub outside of Ireland.

With Mr. Power's retirement, Kevin Barry's will be sorely missed.

We congratulate Mr. Power on his retirement. We thank him for letting all Savannahians and visitors, alike, enjoy Kevin Barry's for the last 40 years.

UNJUST IRANIAN AMERICAN DETENTIONS

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, America is less safe when the words and actions of our leaders cast unnecessary suspicion on our fellow citizens. America is less safe when families, including children, are targeted by government officials based on their ethnicity or by their country of origin.

Reports of unjust, prolonged detentions of Iranian Americans and permanent residents at our borders should be alarming to everyone. It calls to mind the unjust internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

My own parents were toddlers in Japanese American internment camps, and they, along with 120,000 others, were unjustly incarcerated, having committed no crimes or acts of disloyalty.

What happened to my family was the result of a failure of political leadership. All of us in this body have a duty to remain vigilant and to defend the dignity of all citizens. To do nothing is to be complicit in violating the spirit of our Constitution and the individual liberties it guarantees.

□ 0915

RURAL AMERICA NEEDS TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR IN UPCOMING CENSUS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the 2020 Census and to emphasize the importance of ensuring that rural America is accounted for.

Our once-a-decade counting of all Americans is important for numerous reasons. Most importantly, census data provides us with a roadmap for allocating hundreds of billions of dollars annually in government services. These include investments in things like education, roads, and bridges, and other areas of importance to rural districts like mine.

I appreciate the U.S. Census Bureau's efforts to streamline government duties by including an online response option this year. However, I am very concerned that rural areas like Kentucky's First Congressional District could get left behind.

Unfortunately, nearly 30 percent of my district lacks internet access or lacks access to reliable connection. This high number is unacceptable and could have dire consequences, including ensuring that people I serve are accounted for.

This startling lack of internet access in rural America is a call to action for Congress to step up to the plate. My office has worked tirelessly to address this issue, including funding critical programs in the 2018 farm bill. But we must do more to expand internet connectivity so that our voices will not be undercounted and left behind.

Without action, small towns across Kentucky and our entire Nation risk being left behind in the upcoming census, an outcome that should be unacceptable to every member of this body.

CONGRATULATING STATE FOOT- BALL CHAMPIONS NORTH SHORE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 2019, the Galena Park ISD's North Shore Senior High School football team became back-to-back State football champions.

It was a hard-fought win, but they won because they worked together as a team displaying much heart and grit on the field. This win was the culmination of an entire year's worth of practice and hard work under the leadership of Coach Kay.

They took nothing for granted and showed the entire State that with hard work and determination, anything is possible. The North Shore Senior High School football team made all of the North Shore Mustangs and the Galena Park ISD community very, very proud.

As their Congresswoman, I was not there, but I was watching from afar cheering them on, and I am so happy to share their achievement with all of Congress on this floor of the House of Representatives.

Congratulations for an amazing win. I know we can do it again, and we will make it a three-peat.

RECOGNIZING OFFICERS OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I rise today to recognize the officers of the United States Capitol Police force for their heroic ac-

tions to save lives as part of their highly trained and committed service to this congressional community throughout 2019.

When they heard the radio call about an unresponsive individual in a car, two officers responded and ultimately saved the life of a man who had suffered a heart attack.

Officers administered tactical combat casualty care to the victim of a shooting and helped get that person to a hospital.

Three officers saved the life of a man who, shockingly, had a heart attack during his visit to this Capitol Building.

These are only a few occasions in an impressive list of heroic actions. We owe our gratitude to all of the officers of the United States Capitol Police force for the hard work they do here.

I thank all of the police force for going the extra mile; not only protecting and defending us here in the congressional community, but for all they do in all of our communities.

PFAS ACTION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 779 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. 535.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) kindly take the chair.

□ 0919

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. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, with Mr. CUELLAR (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, January 9, 2020, amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 116-366 offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 18, after "a disadvantaged community" insert "or a disproportionately exposed community".

Page 37, after line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"(3) DISPROPORTIONATELY EXPOSED COMMUNITY.—The term 'disproportionately exposed

community' means a community in which climate change, pollution, or environmental destruction have exacerbated systemic racial, regional, social, environmental, and economic injustices by disproportionately affecting indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, or youth."

Page 37, line 14, strike "(3)" and insert "(4)".

Page 37, line 18, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to fight alongside Representatives DINGELL and KILDEE in protecting our water and environment. I also appreciate Chairman PALLONE for working with us on this critical issue to Michigan and the Nation.

The amendment ensures frontline communities like mine who have been directly harmed by the lack of urgency to address the public health impacts due to environmental injustices have a true seat at the table when it comes to addressing this crisis.

I grew up in southwest Detroit which houses the most polluted ZIP Code in the State; where the smell isn't normal; where our kids go to schools that don't have clean drinking water, where our parks are closed down, literally, barred away from residents having access to it because the soil is too contaminated; and where so many of our residents live in fear that the polluting industry nearby is killing them.

Two communities I represent within Wayne County, Michigan, found PFAS contamination. In the recent Metro Times publication, there was a powerful, yet tragic, statement on what residents in 48217 are forced to live with. "Gone are the fruit trees and vegetable gardens. Residents no longer grow produce because the air and the ground are too contaminated with hazardous substances."

The amendment before us clearly defines disadvantaged, exposed communities and ensures that priority for infrastructure funding to combat PFAS go to these frontline communities like our own 48217 and other neighborhoods.

If we are not intentional about where we put our resources to address this crisis, then we are not serious about universal clean air and water. This amendment will ensure that we have equitable funding that goes to neighborhoods that have been ignored for far too long.

I urge you to support the frontline communities amendment and safeguard the health and environmental justice of the neighborhoods that have historically been victim of structural racism and disinvestment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

BARRAGÁN), my good colleague and partner in this fight who is the cosponsor of this amendment.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Too often our communities of color are left behind. Too often, they are on the front lines of environmental injustice. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this bill with Representatives TLAIB and OCASIO-CORTEZ.

Our amendment makes sure that help gets to the people who need it the most. It requires the newly established PFAS community water systems grant program to prioritize communities that are disproportionately exposed to environmental harms and public health impacts from pollution.

Many of those communities are communities like my very own district. Communities of color and low-income communities are disproportionately exposed to PFAS contamination. They often face a variety of environmental threats, such as: exhaust from congested highways, water runoff or air pollution from toxic chemical facilities, and close proximity to landfills.

When a grant application to address PFAS contamination is under consideration, these communities that have exposure first and worst should get priority. It shouldn't be an afterthought. That is why this is a critical first step to ensuring the Safe Drinking Water Act prioritizes environmental justice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, again, I support this amendment and thank my colleagues for working on this.

Growing up in southwest Detroit, the stories of the smell, but not only the fact that we didn't understand why parks and certain chemicals and so forth were exposed to us, is so important. That is why this amendment is so critically important; not only for 48217, but the cities of Melvindale, as well as the Delray neighborhood within southwest Detroit, again, have been exposed to PFAS contamination.

These are two communities, literally, steps away from the Detroit riverfront, and that is why it is critically important for us to push forward on addressing the PFAS contamination across this Nation.

I want to thank my colleagues in understanding why it is important for the Great Lakes State of Michigan that we need to be able to take care of our frontline communities first to really be able to ensure that we have access to clean water universally.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, we obviously support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Safe Drinking Water Act already makes special priority for what is termed "disadvantaged communities" which is based on affordability criteria.

I wish my colleagues who offered this amendment would have been here last night when we passed an amendment to support rich communities who have already funded their cleanup and are allowing them then to dip back into Federal funds to make the payment.

So they may have, if they had a chance to be here for that amendment, voted against communities that have already been able to afford to clean up, but we are going to dip into this money at the expense of poor communities. So that is kind of what occurred last night.

This covers a range of low-income communities that may have trouble paying for infrastructure needs and has been widely supported as an appropriate function of taxpayer support. This amendment creates a broad new category that disproportionately exposes, and which would appear to expand coverage beyond economic factors which may actually undermine the straightforward support for the poor and the disadvantaged already in statute.

I respect the desire to ensure prioritization to communities that may be particularly hard hit with other economic and environmental issues, but the workability of the new definition has not been closely examined and may complicate the provisions of resources to those communities that need it. A better way to do this would be to require a rulemaking to sort out the best approach to prioritize funding to disadvantaged people.

In a letter written by the water communities, one paragraph says—and I would hope my colleagues would listen to this—because in every community we have water companies that are supposed to provide safe drinking water to our citizens. So the water companies have written to us about this bill. And that is the American Water Works Association, the Metropolitan Water Agencies, the National Association of Water Companies, the National Water Resources Association, the National Rural Water Association, and Water Environment Federation.

These are the people who are going to provide clean drinking water to our constituents, and this is what they say about this bill:

"Unfortunately, H.R. 535 would leave municipal water and wastewater system customers subject to financial liability for PFAS cleanup under CERCLA," i.e., the Superfund, "even in cases where the system followed all applicable laws and regulations related to

PFAS disposal. This is in direct contrast to the objective of holding polluters responsible.”

I include their letter in the RECORD.

JANUARY 8, 2020.

Re Opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations representing the nation's drinking water and wastewater utilities are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019. Unfortunately, the legislation fails to protect water system customers from liability for PFAS cleanup costs.

We believe that per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) should be kept out of our nation's water supplies, and that PFAS polluters should be held responsible. The fundamental mission of water and wastewater utilities is to protect public health and the environment, and in doing so they must also be mindful of affordability and the financial burden borne by their customers and the communities they serve. Utilities are tremendously concerned about what PFAS is doing in their communities and, as they have done with all previous public health and environmental challenges, are committed partners in finding a solution to this problem.

However, Congress must make a distinction between entities that introduced PFAS into the environment, and water and wastewater systems that are on the front lines of cleaning up the contamination. Utilities are not the producers of PFAS, but the receivers of PFAS and must dispose of water and wastewater treatment byproducts containing traces of the chemicals. A water system that follows all applicable laws in its disposal of water treatment byproducts containing PFAS should not be held liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) for any further environmental cleanup costs related to these chemicals. Doing so would penalize customers twice: once when they make investments to remove PFAS from their waters, and again when they are forced to pay to cleanup PFAS contamination elsewhere.

Unfortunately, H.R. 535 would leave municipal water and wastewater systems customers subject to financial liability for PFAS cleanup under CERCLA—even in cases where the system followed all applicable laws and regulations related to PFAS disposal. This is in direct contrast to the objective of holding polluters responsible.

It is particularly disappointing that the manager's amendment proposed for H.R. 535 would offer a CERCLA liability shield to airports that are required to use firefighting foam containing PFAS, but fails to extend that same protection to water and wastewater systems who may be required to remove and dispose of PFAS. As receivers of PFAS, water utilities should be afforded the same liability protections that airports are being awarded in the legislation.

Again, we share the goal of keeping the nation's waters free of PFAS and holding accountable those entities that are responsible for environmental contamination. But because H.R. 535 would leave water system customers unprotected against liability for environmental cleanup of PFAS, we have no choice but to oppose the legislation in its current form.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN WATER WORKS
ASSOCIATION.
ASSOCIATION OF
METROPOLITAN WATER
AGENCIES.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CLEAN WATER AGENCIES.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WATER COMPANIES.
NATIONAL WATER
RESOURCES ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL RURAL WATER
ASSOCIATION.
WATER ENVIRONMENT
FEDERATION.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, it is just amazing that last night, the National Journal published an article called: “PFAS Bill Could Spark Tort ‘Bonanza’.”

□ 0930

I will read from that: “An association of U.S. trial lawyers with deep lobbying pockets and the ear of influential Democrats is helping to push a sweeping chemical-regulation package that could pave the way for a prolific legal bumper crop.”

This is not just a forever chemical debate. This is a forever litigation debate, litigation after litigation as Superfund sites get established. They are there for decades, as I quoted last night numerous times. We have Superfund sites that have been identified that are still unremediated 30 to 40 years after they were established.

This bill attempts to use the Superfund as the silver bullet to address this concern. I mentioned last night, but it is a new day: This is the first time in the history of the Superfund legislation that, in the Clean Water Act, we are legislatively identifying a chemical as hazardous not using the scientific process.

For that and all the other reasons, I ask for a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAB).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR.
MALINOWSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 46, line 12, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act”.

Page 46, beginning on line 14, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act”.

Page 46, beginning on line 17, strike “or cooking utensil” and insert “cooking utensil, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED
BY MR. MALINOWSKI

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 PRINTED
IN PART B OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 116-366

OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI OF NEW JERSEY
The amendment is modified to read as follows:

— Page 46, line 12, insert “, or a stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act” before “to meet”.

— Page 46, line 15, insert “, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating” before “does not contain”.

— Page 46, line 18, insert “, or stain resistant, water resistant, or grease resistant coating not subject to requirements under section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act” before “that the Administrator”.

Mr. MALINOWSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the modification.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act, and my amendment to the bill, which gives manufacturers an opportunity to be transparent with consumers and make clear that their products are indeed free of PFAS.

PFAS chemicals are found in coatings that line products like nonstick pots and pans, waterproof clothing, and grease-resistant and fast-food containers, items that we use every day and rarely think about. We are now well aware of the devastating harm that these chemicals can cause, like growth and learning delays in infants and children, an increased risk of birth defects, weakened immune systems, decreased fertility, and an increased risk of cancer.

Each year, billions of pounds of these products are dumped into landfills or burned in incinerators, releasing PFAS pollutants into the air, water, and soil, contaminating the food we eat and the water we drink. In my district in New Jersey, there are over 133 contaminated sites, more than 30 of which are schools.

Right now, consumers have no way of knowing for sure whether products like

the water-resistant spray that we put on our shoes and jackets or the stain-resistant sprays we put on our furniture, rugs, and carpets are or are not contaminated with PFAS coatings that can harm our health.

My amendment would alleviate this problem. It will add stain-, water-, and grease-resistant coatings to the list of products eligible for a voluntary label indicating the absence of PFAS, which will allow consumers to make safer and more informed decisions about the products that we purchase.

We must start holding polluting companies accountable for the chemicals that they are putting into the products that we bring to our homes and give to our children, but we should also be giving companies that do the right thing and that protect consumers a way to be recognized and a way to be rewarded for responsible behavior.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to voting for this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Once again, this is simply about greater transparency. It is about giving consumers choice. It is about American companies that have done the right thing that are facing competition often from abroad, often from companies that have not done the right thing, giving them a chance to put a credible label on their products that says: This is safe. This is PFAS-free.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment. I hope that everybody accepts it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, we addressed an amendment like this last night from the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE). Very similar, and I will raise the same objections.

I have been here a long time, and I actually remember the Alar scare. I also remember BPA, bisphenol A. That is the plastic—it was a kind of the same type—that was going to kill everybody, and we ought to ban it. We went through the scientific process and found out that it wasn't.

In the meantime, did we need the government to offer labeling a “-free” product? The answer in the example of BPA is no.

Bisphenol A was used in baby bottles. Company retailers that made bottles with other substances had no problems. In fact, it was a great marketing attempt for them to say that it was BPA-free.

They didn't need government to do that. They did it because of the advertising and the consumer potential to do that.

There will be, and there are, companies trying to do the right thing. They should take advantage of that opportunity, especially in this environment when we are dealing with 7,866 per- and polyfluorinated compounds. The debate is that every one of those 7,866 compounds is hazardous and destructive to individuals. If you are making a product, this is a perfect time to be able to do that and say that it is PFAS-free.

Why would we have the government do that? Some could argue that this is a corporate perk, that we are incentivizing and rewarding companies through government action to do something that if they are good stewards, they should be able to do on their own. That is why I have some concerns with this.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD another letter from numerous of these companies—some you would label bad actors; some you would label good actors—as they submitted a letter in opposition to this overall bill.

JANUARY 8, 2020.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: PFAS are a large and diverse group of chemicals with unique properties that have been used in a broad number of beneficial applications for years. Heightened attention to potential health effects of certain PFAS has led to an increased public concern and interest in new regulatory protections in this area.

We understand these concerns and are committed to working with legislators, regulators, and all stakeholders to establish risk-based standards that protect human health and the environment. We also support the development of a consistent approach and clear timelines for assessing and regulating specific PFAS across all relevant federal agencies to ensure that government regulations, actions, and communications are coordinated for maximum effectiveness.

Any federal action should not address PFAS as a class or with predetermined outcomes, but rather should be based on sound science and the weight of the scientific evidence. Further, Congress should not circumvent existing regulatory authorities. The Environmental Protection Agency, as well as other relevant agencies, should retain their traditional power to study PFAS and determine whether to regulate certain PFAS. Many provisions included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, signed into law at the end of last year, took important steps towards meeting those goals.

We look forward to working with you on this important matter as the legislative process continues. We oppose H.R. 535, the “PFAS Action Act of 2019.”

Sincerely,

U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Advamed, Airlines for America, American Chemistry Council, American Coatings Association, American Forest & Paper Association, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, American Petroleum Institute, Associated General Contractors of America, Flexible Packaging Association, Foodservice Packaging Institute.

International Liquid Terminals Association, National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Plastics Industry Association (PLASTICS), Single Ply Roofing Industry, Society of Chemical Manufacturers and Affiliates, Specialty Graphic Imaging Association,

TRSA—The Linen, Uniform and Facility Services Association.

Mr. SHIMKUS. They say in this letter: “Any Federal action should not address PFAS as a class or with predetermined outcomes, but rather should be based on sound science and the weight of the scientific evidence.”

As I said before, this is the first time in the history of the country that we are labeling a chemical formulation as toxic politically using political science, not science.

They go on to say: “Further, Congress should not circumvent existing regulatory authorities. The Environmental Protection Agency, as well as other relevant agencies, should retain their traditional power to study PFAS and determine whether to regulate certain PFAS. Many provisions included in the National Defense Authorization Act”—we talked about that a lot last night—“for Fiscal Year 2020, signed into law at the end of last year, took important steps toward meeting those goals.” There is a list of 30 or 40 organizations. I am not going to read them all this morning.

I appreciate my colleague's amendment. We actually were close when we were thinking about getting a bipartisan bill to bring to the floor. This was one of the provisions that was on the table. My friends, I believe, couldn't say yes, so here we are, fighting this bill that the Senate will not take up, and the President will not sign, and you will have to wait for the next Congress to address this issue.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

(c) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a review of actions by the Environmental Protection Agency to clean up contamination of the substances designated pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of cleanup progress and effectiveness, including the following:

(A) The number of sites where the Environmental Protection Agency has acted to remediate contamination of the substances designated pursuant to subsection (a).

(B) Which types of chemicals relating to such substances were present at each site

and the extent to which each site was contaminated.

(C) An analysis of discrepancies in cleanup between Federal and non-Federal contamination sites.

(D) Any other elements the Administrator may determine necessary.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(A) The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires, within 5 years, a comprehensive report to Congress by the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, regarding the actions the Agency will take to clean up and remediate PFAS contamination sites once we pass the important bill before us into law.

I would like to begin by thanking my friend Chairman PALLONE and his staff for working with me on this, as well as my fellow Michiganders, Congresswoman DINGELL, Congressman UPTON, and Congressman KILDEE, for their bipartisan leadership on this bill.

I am proud that this bill includes my bill cosponsored with Representative KHANNA, the PFAS Safe Disposal Act, which prohibits unsafe incineration of PFAS. We need to ensure that when PFAS chemicals are destroyed by incineration, PFAS particles are not emitted into the air. The monumental effort of PFAS cleanup will be for naught if PFAS is simply transmitted from water and soil into the air we breathe.

We in Michigan know all too well the growing threat that PFAS chemicals pose to our communities and our water resources. They have been linked to cancer, damage to both reproductive and immune systems, developmental issues, and changes in liver, immune, and thyroid functions.

The troubling reality is that both industry and the EPA itself have known about the risks from PFAS chemicals for decades. We know, for example, that industry studies have demonstrated the adverse health effects of these chemicals since as early as 1950. That is 70 years ago. We also know that even though the EPA has recognized the risks of PFAS since at least 1995, the Agency is continuing to allow new PFAS chemicals onto the market to this day.

By passing H.R. 535 into law, we can finally begin to reverse decades of the EPA's failure and finally deliver the protections impacted communities need in both the short and long term. But after decades of the EPA failing to treat this matter with urgency, we need to make sure that the cleanup process that will be set in place, once

we finally designate PFOA and PFAS as hazardous substances, is both timely and effective.

My amendment is a commonsense transparency and accountability measure that requires the EPA to submit a comprehensive review to Congress after 5 years of cleanup efforts. The report required by my amendment will include the number of sites that have to be remediated, the types of PFAS chemicals present at each site, an analysis of discrepancies and cleanup between Federal and non-Federal contamination sites, and more.

For the sake of our constituents and after so many years of inexcusable threats to their health, Congress must ensure that EPA's PFAS cleanup efforts are effective.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate him on his important amendment. I hope this important study will be part of that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to come to the floor to join our colleagues, the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the former chair, Mr. UPTON, in their bipartisan support of this legislation.

I salute Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, a crusader in this urgent mission to protect our communities from PFAS chemicals.

I also thank Mr. TONKO, the chair of the Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The list goes on and on, and I will name some more.

Last year, our Members worked relentlessly to pass bold legislation to tackle the PFAS crisis. We salute the Members whose bills were included in the bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act agreement reached by the House.

□ 0945

Unfortunately, at the end of the year, the Senate GOP refused to join the House to secure full, robust protections against PFAS chemicals, and key provisions were cut from the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. The Senate GOP obstruction is why we are here today.

We are also here today because our distinguished chairman, Mr. PALLONE, promised that we would have a chance to vote on robust legislation after the first of the year. I thank the chairman.

PFAS chemicals are a serious public health threat, contaminating the water

we drink, the air we breathe, and the food we eat. These forever chemicals—which do not break down easily—are exposing millions of Americans to liver disease, asthma, thyroid dysfunction, multiple forms of cancer, and further health threats.

Today, nearly all Americans, including newborn babies, expectant mothers, and children, have PFAS in their blood; and up to 110 million people may be drinking tainted water, including, as our colleagues from Michigan have indicated, the challenge in their State indicated by the leadership and demonstrated on the floor in a bipartisan way on this issue.

Our colleague from Hoosick Falls, New York, Mr. DELGADO, has been a champion on this issue. Their contamination from a plastics factory raised the level of PFAS chemicals in residents' blood to 100 times the national average, Mr. SHIMKUS.

In Chincoteague, Virginia, near Maryland, where I grew up, contamination from NASA Wallops Flight Center forced the local community to find an entirely new drinking water supply. And we thank Congresswoman LURIA for her leadership in all of this.

And Mr. PAPPAS, also with ANNIE KUSTER, has a situation in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where contamination from Pease Air Force Base poisoned the drinking water of thousands of residents, including children and infants.

Mr. Chair, before we won the majority, we had a hearing. It really was about a number of issues, environmental justice being one of them. Reverend Barbera brought people from all over the country to talk about this. I particularly remember our conversations in the testimony of Peggy Price.

She came and told the story of her family and how they were affected by what was happening at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. It was a very sad story. Their families suffered, the parents, the children—just a horrible situation. They were serving our country at Camp Lejeune, and they were victimized by the water supply there.

Particularly egregious, is the epidemic of contamination on military sites, as I mentioned just now, and more than 400 sites across the United States are affected. It is unacceptable that our men and women who sacrifice to keep us safe around the world face this danger in their health at home.

Sadly, some big corporations and the EPA have known about the risks from PFAS chemicals for decades, but they have failed to prevent the spread of contamination. The Trump administration's EPA is breaking its own promises every day that it delays and puts polluters ahead of the American people.

In stark contrast, the House is taking action. We are cleaning up communities by designating PFAS as a hazardous substance by the EPA, which is the key barrier to cleaning up military and industrial sites.

We are also creating new, robustly funded grants, in partnership with States, to help with cleanup and remediation efforts. Hopefully, we will be adding this important study that Mr. LEVIN is proposing to this legislation.

And we are helping stem the tide of further contamination with tough, new testing reporting and monitoring requirements, strict limits on the introduction of new PFAS chemicals, limits on air emissions, and banning unsafe incineration—strong measures to hold contaminating companies accountable.

Last month, the Senate GOP fought to prevent many of these lifesaving measures from becoming law in the NDAA. Now, Senator MCCONNELL will have to explain once again to the American people why he is blocking our bipartisan action to clean up contaminated communities.

I urge a strong vote on this legislation to keep the American people healthy and safe and, again, salute all of those who have worked so hard to bring this legislation to the floor in a bipartisan way.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, while people may have all kinds of opinions on the underlying issue, this amendment is simply about sunshine. It simply is about good government: Will our Federal agencies tell our Article I body here what they are up to? I think it just makes all kinds of sense to ask them to give us a comprehensive report after a reasonable period of time, so I hope everyone can support this amendment.

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

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

I am happy to follow the Speaker, and I do have great respect for her. It gets me in trouble in my district every now and then when I talk about our relationship, but it has to be said that I can't allow a revisionist history to report on what occurred, especially on the Safe Drinking Water Act and in the final negotiations.

It is well-reported that there was a three-corner agreement. One corner couldn't get there, and that is why we didn't have it. I won't name names. I won't point fingers. But to point this over at our friends in the other side of the building where they had come to an agreement, that is just not accurate.

I would also point out that, in this bill, we are exempting airports from Superfund liability. We are not exempting medical devices. We are not exempting military contractors. We are not exempting water companies. We are exempting airports who use,

probably the most toxic of all these chemicals: firefighter foam. Somehow, they were able to get a carve-out where other companies, industries, could not.

The only other organization that benefitted was the Trial Lawyer Association. I want to mention that again. It is amazing, the article came out last night. I am not sure how that happened, but it states in the article:

An association of U.S. trial lawyers with deep lobbying pockets and an ear of influential Democrats is helping to push a sweeping chemical regulation package that could pave the way for a prolific legal bumper crop.

Now, where would that happen in this bill? Well, it would happen in the Kildee amendment that we passed last night, which would federalize information publication that States should handle. We can get that at the Federal level, then the trial bar could go through this information. The Pappas amendment had unrealistic deadlines, so they had this litigation based upon not being able to meet a deadline.

Then you have section 2 of the Superfund designation without science and unrealistic review deadlines.

Section 4, toxic labeling of unrealistic risks without a review.

Section 15, Clean Air Act designation without science and unrealistic review deadlines.

And the Brindisi amendment, we passed, that makes it marginally better, but, of course, not good enough for us to be able to accept that—or at least me—in the vote on the floor.

So, if this colleague of mine would amend this amendment and say let's have transparency on the class action lawsuits, then the litigation and the legal costs of doing this—we know that Superfund designation is not a silver bullet to cleanup, and I used this numerous times last night.

Old Springfield, Vermont, was added on the Superfund list, September 8, 1983. Guess where it is 36 years later? Still on the Superfund list.

Colbert Landfill, Spokane, Washington, added September 8, 1983. Guess what it is? Still a Superfund site 36 years later.

We should do a transparency look at how much litigation and money has been spent, both by the government and lawyers, on these Superfund sites. And, if we want to talk about transparency, I think that would also be a good way. Maybe we could have a bipartisan agreement on timelines and remediation, but also follow the money. Where is the money going?

So this amendment does not require informing Congress of private-sector actions to clean up PFAS under Superfund and is unclear how much cleanup is being done by other Federal agencies. Plus, this is something that the Government Accountability Office or the congressional committees could do without such expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116-366.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 47, after line 15, insert the following:

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the head of the U.S. Fire Administration and other relevant Federal departments or agencies, shall report to Congress on the efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency and other relevant Federal departments and agencies to identify viable alternatives to firefighting foam and other related equipment containing any PFAS.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 779, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the PFAS Action Act, which would require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with other relevant government agencies, to report to Congress on efforts to identify viable alternatives to PFAS firefighting foam and other related equipment containing PFAS.

PFAS contamination hits particularly close to home for me and my constituents. We in Michigan are confronting widespread PFAS contamination in our water, chemicals that we know are linked to cancer and other diseases.

This past summer, I toured Strawberry Lake, part of Livingston County's beautiful chain of lakes in my district, where foam resulting from PFAS buildup is visible in plain sight.

I held a forum focused on PFAS contamination in Pinckney, Michigan, a community that has been under a "do not eat fish" advisory for over a year and a "do not touch foam" advisory for many months. The more than 200 attendees expressed deep concern about the impact of PFAS contamination on their health, safety, and livelihoods, and had simple questions about how to know whether their water is safe to drink, eat fish from, or even touch.

In September, I met with Brighton Fire Chief Michael O'Brien and fire chiefs from across Livingston County and discussed their concerns about exposure to firefighting foam that contains high concentrations of PFAS.

PFAS presents alarming health risks. According to the CDC, exposure to PFAS can affect growth, learning, and behavior in infants and older children; lower a woman's chance of getting pregnant; increase the risk of cancer; and impact the immune system. In

fact, one of my constituents, who spent his career as an auto mechanic and was exposed to PFAS-contaminated materials on a daily basis, is now connecting his diagnosis of MS, or an autoimmune disease, to his exposure to PFAS at work.

In Michigan, the high levels of PFAS have been detected in 34 sites, including at Diamond Chrome Plating in my district.

In addition, these chemicals have been found at some level in municipal drinking water serving more than 2 million people across the State.

PFAS has been detected in 54 Michigan schools, including 5 schools in my district.

Last summer, the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services issued an emergency “do not eat” advisory regarding all fish from sections of the Huron River in my district after fish from Kent Lake were discovered to contain very high levels of PFAS.

Let me be clear: I believe that access to clean water out of your tap is a right and not a privilege.

□ 1000

I believe that environmental security is homeland security. If it is threatening the safety and security of your family and preservation of your way of life, that is homeland security.

When Michigan families can't be confident that the water they are giving their children to drink won't make them sick or give them a learning disability; when they can no longer fish the rivers or hunt in the areas they have hunted for years with their families, that is a threat to our security, to our way of life.

It doesn't matter if you are a Democrat, or a Republican, or an Independent, if you are going to hand your child a glass of water, you should be confident it won't cause cancer or other lifelong health issues. That is your family, and that is their safety.

My amendment would simply require the EPA to report to Congress on efforts to identify viable alternatives to products and equipment containing PFAS, including firefighting foam used on our military bases.

The PFAS Action Act of 2019 does a great deal to meet the threat of PFAS contamination with robust legislation that responds to it. And my amendment will hold Federal agencies accountable for finding viable alternatives to prevent further PFAS contamination.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not believe I will oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I have no speakers and I am prepared to close after the gentleman closes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to close. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I ask for the bill to be supported, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman brings up an issue about firefighter foam. She talks about military installations. She does not talk about commercial aviation and waterway issues which are exempted in this bill.

Again, I am not sure why we are wanting to clean up all PFAS contamination, the world is ending, but we exempt airports. We don't exempt medical devices.

Let me hold up this. This was used last night. This is a medical device that is inserted into a child, maybe an unborn child, to close a hole in the heart. FDA said this is safe to insert into a heart. You want to talk about daily exposure? Here is daily exposure in an infant child.

So the nexus between the gentlewoman's amendment and this debate is that maybe when we are investigating firefighter foam for alternatives, maybe we are going to investigate alternatives for this type.

FDA has approved this. So why are we going to possibly ban chemicals?

We also mentioned last night that the Food and Drug Administration has claimed PFAS lining for food packages is safe. So we already have government entities that have investigated portions of the PFAS world.

Remember, we are talking about 7,866 different permutations; not one chemical, not two chemicals, but 7,866. And this is the first time in the history of our Nation that, without science and due diligence, we are going to label a chemical as toxic. That is part of the objection.

Let's use real science. I get beat up all the time, being a science-denier, climate change.

Here, my friends on the Democrat side aren't ready to rely on science to address each of these 7,866 different applications. In fact, they are trying to, in this legislation, cause a rush to judgment, create an inability for the EPA to make a decision. So then, the companies can be sued because there is no way they can meet the timelines based upon this bill.

I would like to also read from the American Council of Engineering Companies letter, a letter that I will ask, at the appropriate time, to submit to the RECORD; and it says this: “By designating certain PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under CERCLA,” which is the Superfund, “as called for in H.R. 535, we are concerned that such action could upset the progress already made to address this challenge, divert resources away from more pressing

threats to water quality, and impose significant costs and liability on our water utility clients and the ratepayers they serve.”

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter I just referenced in the RECORD.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
ENGINEERING COMPANIES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and
Commerce, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE AND RANKING MEMBER WALDEN: On behalf of the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)—the business association of the nation's engineering industry—we wish to express our concerns over H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act. While we agree that aggressive steps are needed to protect water resources from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contamination, we believe that ongoing efforts at the federal level to develop risk-based regulations offer a more effective approach to address this problem.

ACEC represents over 5,500 engineering companies and thousands of engineering professionals who work on a daily basis to improve the nation's water infrastructure and protect human health and the environment. While PFAS chemicals have been in wide use for many decades, concerns have emerged in recent years regarding the health effects of certain types of PFAS. In response to this, federal and state regulators, as well as water supply, wastewater and other stakeholders are working together to define the public health risks of the PFAS chemicals as well as consideration of technologies to cost-effectively mitigate those risks.

The Council supports this deliberative, consistent and data-driven approach to developing risk-based PFAS standards. By designating certain PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under CERCLA (Superfund), as called for in H.R. 535, we are concerned that such action could upset the progress already made to address this challenge, divert resources away from more pressing threats to water quality, and impose significant costs and liability on our water utility clients and the ratepayers they serve.

We would respectfully urge the House to reconsider this approach, and instead work to support and where necessary enhance the existing regulatory framework and action plan.

Sincerely,

LINDA BAUER DARR,
President & CEO.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I already asked for inclusion in the RECORD a letter from the local municipal water plants, or the rural water associations, or the for-profit-owned water companies who said this makes it more difficult for us to clean up the water. We are going to be held to Superfund liability. We have to pay the court costs.

Now we have exempted airports. We haven't exempted the water companies. That is really just a pass-through. They are receiving, they are cleaning up, and then they are disposing, but we are not going to exempt them. We are going to exempt airports.

We are not going to exempt medical device manufacturers who are saving

the lives of unborn children who have daily exposure of PFAS; and this is a lifesaving application.

This is just one of many. I could pull up heart stents. Last night we also talked about F-16s and our defense industry.

Maybe, with this amendment, we will do due diligence and find a suitable chemical formula that will replace this. So I applaud it. I think it is well thought of. It is meaningful.

I would also like to, in the end, because this will probably be my last time to be able to talk on this. We, on both sides of the aisle, really need to thank legislative counsel, because of the short timeframe they had in the amendment offerings, their response to the majority's concerns and writing. And actually, obviously, we are probably more difficult because we are trying to really dig in and find the fallacies of the coming amendments.

So my personal thanks to legislative counsel and professional staff who worked tirelessly on behalf of both sides.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-366 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BALDERSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. PAPPAS of New Hampshire.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) 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 161, noes 247, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

AYES—161

Abraham	Arrington	Banks
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amash	Bacon	Bergman
Amodei	Baird	Biggs
Armstrong	Balderson	Bilirakis

Bishop (NC)	Hagedorn	Pence	McCarthy	Reed	Stefanik
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Perry	McCollum	Rice (NY)	Stevens
Bost	Hartzler	Peterson	McEachin	Richmond	Suozi
Brooks (AL)	Hern, Kevin	Ratcliffe	McGovern	Rooney (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler	McNerney	Rose (NY)	Takano
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)	Meeks	Rouda	Thompson (CA)
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman	Meng	Rouzer	Thompson (MS)
Burchett	Hill (AR)	Roby	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Rodgers (WA)	Morelle	Ruiz	Tlaib
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Roe, David P.	Moulton	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Rush	Torres (CA)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)	Murphy (FL)	Ryan	Torres Small
Chabot	Jordan	Rose, John W.	Napolitano	Sablan	(NM)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Roy	Neal	San Nicolas	Trahan
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford	Neguse	Sánchez	Trone
Cloud	Katko	Scalise	Norcross	Sarbanes	Turner
Cole	Keller	Schweikert	Norton	Scanlon	Underwood
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin	O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Upton
Comer	Kelly (IA)	Sensenbrenner	Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff	Van Drew
Conaway	King (PA)	Shimkus	Omar	Schneider	Vargas
Cook	Kinzinger	Smith (MO)	Pallone	Schrader	Veasey
Crenshaw	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)	Panetta	Schrier	Vela
Curtis	LaHood	Spano	Pappas	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Stauber	Pascrell	Scott, David	Visclosky
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Steil	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
DeJarlais	Latta	Steube	Peters	Shalala	Schultz
Diaz-Balart	Lesko	Stewart	Phillips	Sherman	Waters
Duncan	Long	Stivers	Pingree	Sherrill	Watson Coleman
Dunn	Lucas	Taylor	Plaskett	Sires	Webster (FL)
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry	Pocan	Slotkin	Welch
Estes	Marshall	Timmons	Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wexton
Ferguson	Massie	Tipton	Posey	Smith (WA)	Wild
Fleischmann	McAdams	Wagner	Pressley	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Flores	McCaull	Walberg	Price (NC)	Spanberger	Yarmuth
Foxx (NC)	McClintock	Walden	Quigley	Speier	Young
Fulcher	McKinley	Walorski	Raskin	Stanton	Zeldin
Gaetz	Meadows	Waltz			
Gianforte	Miller	Watkins			
Gibbs	Mitchell	Weber (TX)	Aderholt	González-Colón	McHenry
Gonzalez (OH)	Moolenaar	Westrup	Brady	(PR)	Meuser
Gooden	Mooney (WV)	Westerman	Buchanan	Granger	Nadler
Gosar	Mullin	Williams	Buck	Hunter	Payne
Graves (GA)	Murphy (NC)	Wilson (SC)	Carter (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Radewagen
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Wittman	Crawford	Kind	Serrano
Graves (MO)	Norman	Womack	Evans	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Griffith	Nunes	Woodall	Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Smucker
Grothman	Olson	Wright	Gohmert	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Guest	Palazzo	Yoho		Marchant	Walker
Guthrie	Palmer				

NOES—247

Adams	Daids (KS)	Horsford
Aguilar	Davis (CA)	Houlahan
Allred	Davis, Danny K.	Hoyer
Axne	Dean	Hudson
Barragán	DeFazio	Huffman
Bass	DeGette	Huizenga
Beatty	DeLauro	Hurd (TX)
Bera	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Beyer	Delgado	Jayapal
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Jeffries
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Johnson (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Kaptur
Bonamici	Dingell	Keating
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Brindisi	Doyle, Michael F.	Kennedy
Brown (MD)	Engel	Khanna
Brownley (CA)	Escobar	Kildee
Bustos	Eshoo	Kilmer
Butterfield	Españat	Kim
Carbajal	Finkenauer	King (NY)
Cárdenas	Fletcher	Krishnamoorthi
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Cartwright	Foster	Lamb
Case	Frankel	Langevin
Casten (IL)	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Lawson (FL)
Ciulline	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Cisneros	Garcia (IL)	Lee (NV)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Levin (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Golden	Levin (MI)
Clay	Gomez	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Gonzalez (TX)	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gottheimer	Loeback
Cohen	Green (TN)	Lofgren
Connolly	Green, Al (TX)	Lowenthal
Cooper	Grijalva	Lowey
Correa	Haaland	Lujan
Costa	Harder (CA)	Luria
Courtney	Hastings	Lynch
Cox (CA)	Hayes	Malinowski
Craig	Heck	Maloney
Crist	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Crow	Himes	Maloney, Sean
Cuellar	Holding	Mast
Cunningham	Horn, Kendra S.	Matsui
		McBath

NOT VOTING—28

	González-Colón	McHenry
	(PR)	Meuser
	Granger	Nadler
	Hunter	Payne
	Johnson (GA)	Radewagen
	Kind	Serrano
	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
	Lewis	Smucker
	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
	Marchant	Walker

□ 1033

Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. ESPAILLAT and VAN DREW changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 9.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BALDERSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 239, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—170

Abraham Gosar
 Allen Graves (GA)
 Amash Graves (LA)
 Amodei Graves (MO)
 Armstrong Green (TN)
 Arrington Griffith
 Babin Grothman
 Bacon Guest
 Baird Guthrie
 Balderson Hagedorn
 Banks Harris
 Barr Hartzler
 Bergman Hern, Kevin
 Biggs Hice (GA)
 Bilirakis Higgins (LA)
 Bishop (NC) Hill (AR)
 Bishop (UT) Holding
 Bost Hollingsworth
 Brooks (AL) Hurd (TX)
 Brooks (IN) Johnson (LA)
 Buck Johnson (OH)
 Bucshon Johnson (SD)
 Budd Jordan
 Burchett Joyce (OH)
 Burgess Joyce (PA)
 Byrne Katko
 Calvert Keller
 Carter (GA) Kelly (MS)
 Chabot Kelly (PA)
 Cheney King (IA)
 Cline Kinzinger
 Cloud Kustoff (TN)
 Cole LaHood
 Collins (GA) LaMalfa
 Comer Lamborn
 Conaway Latta
 Cook Lesko
 Crenshaw Long
 Curtis Lucas
 Davidson (OH) Luetkemeyer
 Davis, Rodney Marshall
 DesJarlais Massie
 Diaz-Balart McAdams
 Duncan McCarthy
 Dunn McCaul
 Emmer McClintock
 Estes McHenry
 Ferguson McKinley
 Fleischmann Meadows
 Flores Miller
 Foxx (NC) Mitchell
 Fulcher Moolenaar
 Gaetz Mooney (WV)
 Gianforte Mullin
 Gibbs Murphy (NC)
 Gonzalez (OH) Newhouse
 Gooden Norman

NOES—239

Adams Connolly
 Aguilar Cooper
 Allred Correa
 Axne Costa
 Barragán Courtney
 Bass Cox (CA)
 Beatty Craig
 Bera Crist
 Beyer Crow
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar
 Blumenauer Cunningham
 Blunt Rochester Davids (KS)
 Bonamici Davis (CA)
 Boyle, Brendan Davis, Danny K.
 F. Dean
 Brindisi DeFazio
 Brown (MD) DeGette
 Brownley (CA) DeLauro
 Bustos DelBene
 Butterfield Delgado
 Carbajal Demings
 Cárdenas DeSaulnier
 Carson (IN) Deutch
 Cartwright Dingell
 Case Doggett
 Casten (IL) Doyle, Michael
 Castor (FL) F.
 Castro (TX) Engel
 Chu, Judy Escobar
 Cicilline Eshoo
 Cisneros Espallat
 Clark (MA) Finkenauer
 Clarke (NY) Fletcher
 Clay Fortenberry
 Cleaver Foster
 Clyburn Frankel
 Cohen Fudge

Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Riggleman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Spano
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yoho
 Zeldin

Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 King (NY)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Luján
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Mast
 Matsui
 Mc Bath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal

Aderholt
 Brady
 Buchanan
 Carter (TX)
 Crawford
 Evans
 Fitzpatrick
 Gohmert
 González-Colón
 (PR)

NOT VOTING—27

Granger
 Scott, Austin
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Lewis
 Loudermilk
 Marchant
 Meuser
 Nadler
 Payne

□ 1038

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 10.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 168, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—242

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Axne
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brindisi
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Green, Al (TX)
 Grijalva
 Haaland
 Harder (CA)
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Hurd (TX)
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 King (NY)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Matsui
 McAdams
 Mc Bath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Norcross
 Norton
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Plaskett
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sablan
 San Nicolas
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Young

NOES—168

Barr
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Bishop (UT)
 Bost
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cole

Comer	Johnson (LA)	Riggleman
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Cook	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
Crenshaw	Jordan	Roe, David P.
Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Davidson (OH)	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Rose, John W.
DesJarlais	Keller	Roy
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Duncan	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Dunn	King (IA)	Schweikert
Emmer	Kinzing	Sensenbrenner
Estes	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Ferguson	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Flores	Lamborn	Spano
Fortenberry	Latta	Staubert
Fox (NC)	Lesko	Stefanik
Fulcher	Long	Steil
Gaetz	Lucas	Steube
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Gianforte	Marshall	Stivers
Gibbs	Massie	Taylor
Gonzalez (OH)	McCarthy	Thornberry
Gooden	McCaul	Timmons
Gosar	McClintock	Tipton
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Wagner
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Miller	Walden
Green (TN)	Mitchell	Walorski
Griffith	Moolenaar	Waltz
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Watkins
Guest	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Murphy (NC)	Webster (FL)
Hagedorn	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Harris	Norman	Westerman
Hartzler	Nunes	Williams
Hern, Kevin	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Hice (GA)	Palazzo	Wittman
Higgins (LA)	Palmer	Womack
Hill (AR)	Pence	Woodall
Holding	Perry	Wright
Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe	Yoho
Hudson	Reschenthaler	Young
Huizenga	Rice (SC)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—26

Aderholt	Granger	Radewagen
Brady	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Buchanan	Kind	Serrano
Carter (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Crawford	Lewis	Smucker
Evans	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Walker
Gohmert	Meuser	
González-Colón	Nadler	
(PR)	Payne	

□ 1044

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 11 and “yea” on rollcall No. 10.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CLAY). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. CLAY, 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. 535) to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and, pursuant to House Resolution 779, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Rodgers of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 535 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 10, line 14, insert “, including any unborn child (as defined in section 1841(d) of title 18, United States Code)” before the period at the end.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this motion is the last opportunity to amend the bill, and it does so without delay in passage.

We all agree that PFAS chemicals that present health risks to the public should be cleaned up as quickly as possible, but it should be done according to the best available science.

The majority often likes to claim that they are the party of science. Unfortunately, this bill ignores science and facts for scoring political talking points by grouping together an entire class of PFAS chemicals. Some of these chemicals are essential to life-saving medical devices; others provide for cutting-edge technologies in aerospace that are critical to our national security.

By ignoring scientific evidence, this bill would kill innovations that could help further lift people's standard of living and save lives.

I understand and share frustrations for slow cleanup of the dangerous PFAS chemicals. In my own district, Fairchild Air Force Base and Airway Heights, Washington, are dealing with PFAS. However, we just passed bipartisan legislation based on science

through the NDAA that will ensure that affected communities are cleaned up quickly. This bill would ignore those efforts.

It is unprecedented that Congress would unilaterally classify chemicals under CERCLA. By doing so, Congress will designate communities like Airway Heights a Superfund site, significantly harming their ability to attract new investments and hurting property values.

Instead of trying to score political points, we should be proud of the bipartisan achievement of the NDAA and continue to work to clean up our communities and get results.

This amendment is a good faith effort to improve this legislation in a way that enhances its efforts to protect all Americans from harmful chemicals.

Section 5 of H.R. 535 seeks to guarantee protection of vulnerable populations from potential PFAS dangers in their drinking waters. It states that the new rules “shall be protective of the health of subpopulations at greater risk.”

The Safe Drinking Water Act already identifies pregnant women as an at-risk group. However, there is not just one. When it comes to pregnant women who are at risk, there are two people at risk: the pregnant woman and the unborn child.

The science is clear. Technology today allows us to look inside the womb. We see the baby's development day by day, week by week. That person is the most vulnerable population that should be protected.

This motion to recommit is simple; it is clear; it is direct. It clarifies that the protection of vulnerable populations must include any unborn child.

Yesterday, Chairman PALLONE recognized the potential harm these chemicals can have on child development. Today, Speaker PELOSI reiterated the importance of protecting expectant mothers. By rejecting this amendment, you would be further denying the science of the development of a child in the womb.

This motion is consistent with policy that EPA itself has employed: considering the impact of chemical exposures to babies in the womb. For example, in 2011, the EPA, under President Obama, decided to regulate certain chemicals in drinking water based in part on the impacts to the in utero person.

Congress also passed bipartisan legislation, a law in 2004, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, recognizing the personhood of an unborn child.

This motion makes a small but vital improvement to this bill. It is an improvement that is necessary to preserve the central goal of the bill's sponsors: protecting vulnerable populations.

If that is the majority's goal, then this amendment should be accepted. It does not strike or delay anything in the bill. It only clarifies what is considered a vulnerable population based

on the same language in the bipartisan 2004 act.

Most importantly, it protects the unborn child, something that I hope everyone in this room can agree should be one of our greatest priorities: to protect people before they are born and at every stage of their life.

I urge my colleagues to support science by supporting my motion to recommit.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my colleague, but I oppose this amendment because it is really nothing more than a political stunt.

This bill will protect communities across this country. The drinking water standard in this bill will be protective of the health of populations at greater risk, what we generally call vulnerable populations.

That requirement was opposed by the Republicans. Mr. SHIMKUS had an amendment to strike that provision of the bill. He opposed protecting vulnerable populations. I deeply respect my colleague, but he opposed it every step of the way; and yesterday, he withdrew that amendment.

If Republicans want to protect vulnerable populations, including pregnant women, infants, and children, they should support this bill.

Let's be very clear: PFAS is an urgent health and environmental threat, period, and no one can deny that.

The number of contamination sites, nationwide, is growing at an alarming rate, including our military bases—almost 400 military installations in this country.

Developed in the 1940s, PFAS is a forever chemical. It is in the blood of more than 99 percent of Americans. It poses potential health risks. We know it. EPA has known the risk for decades and allowed this contamination to spread.

EPA is not going to take care of this problem. Congress needs to act. The longer we wait, the worse the contamination becomes. The time is now to act on the PFAS Action Act. We have got to do it together. The American people count on us.

The bill is a strong and serious package, and it is supported by some Republicans. It will jump-start cleanups. It will get PFAS out of our drinking water. It will limit PFAS in the air. It will limit PFAS in our rivers and streams. It will drive and require comprehensive testing for PFAS, and it will give our first responders and consumers tools to protect themselves.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this motion to recommit and urge Members to support the underlining bill so we can work together to enact laws that protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, 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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 219, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—187

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Allen	Green (TN)	Pence
Amash	Griffith	Perry
Amodei	Grothman	Peterson
Armstrong	Guest	Posey
Arrington	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Babin	Hagedorn	Reed
Bacon	Harris	Reschenthaler
Baird	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Balderson	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Banks	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Barr	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Bergman	Higgins (LA)	Roe, David P.
Biggs	Hill (AR)	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Hollingsworth	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Bost	Huizenga	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Roy
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Buchson	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Budd	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Joyce (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Joyce (PA)	Shimkus
Byrne	Katko	Smith (MO)
Calvert	Keller	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Spano
Cheney	King (IA)	Stauber
Cline	King (NY)	Stefanik
Cloud	Kinzinger	Steil
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Collins (GA)	LaHood	Stewart
Comer	LaMalfa	Stivers
Conaway	Lamborn	Taylor
Cook	Latta	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Lesko	Timmons
Cuellar	Lipinski	Turner
Curtis	Long	Upton
Davidson (OH)	Lucas	Van Drew
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
DesJarlais	Marshall	Walberg
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Walden
Duncan	Mast	Walorski
Dunn	McAdams	Waltz
Emmer	McCarthy	Watkins
Estes	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Wenstrup
Flores	McKinley	Westerman
Fortenberry	Meadows	Williams
Foxx (NC)	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Mitchell	Wittman
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Womack
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gianforte	Mullin	Wright
Gibbs	Murphy (NC)	Yoho
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Young
Gooden	Norman	Zeldin
Gosar	Nunes	
Graves (GA)	Olson	
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	

NOES—219

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Omar
Aguilar	Golden	Pallone
Allred	Gomez	Panetta
Axne	Gonzalez (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pascarell
Bass	Green, Al (TX)	Perlmutter
Beatty	Grijalva	Peters
Bera	Haaland	Phillips
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Pocan
Blumenauer	Hayes	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Pressley
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Price (NC)
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Quigley
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Raskin
Brindisi	Horsford	Rice (NY)
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Richmond
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rose (NY)
Bustos	Huffman	Rouda
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carbajal	Jayapal	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Ryan
Case	Kaptur	Sánchez
Casten (IL)	Keating	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schneider
Cisneros	Kilmer	Schrader
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schrier
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cleaver	Lamb	Sewell (AL)
Clyburn	Langevin	Shalala
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cooper	Lawrence	Sires
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Costa	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lee (NV)	Soto
Cox (CA)	Levin (CA)	Spanberger
Craig	Levin (MI)	Speier
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Stanton
Crow	Loebach	Stevens
Cunningham	Lofgren	Suozi
Davids (KS)	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Takano
Davis, Danny K.	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
Dean	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lynch	Titus
DeGette	Malinowski	Tlaib
DeLauro	Maloney	Tonko
DelBene	Carolyn B.	Torres (CA)
Delgado	Maloney, Sean	Torres Small
Demings	Matsui	(NM)
DeSaulnier	McBath	Trahan
Deutch	McCollum	Trone
Dingell	McEachin	Underwood
Doggett	McGovern	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Veasey
F.	Meeks	Vela
Engel	Meng	Velázquez
Escobar	Moore	Visclosky
Eshoo	Morelle	Wasserman
Espallat	Moulton	Schultz
Finkenauer	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Foster	Napolitano	Welch
Frankel	Neal	Wexton
Fudge	Neguse	Wild
Galleo	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt	Gohmert	Meuser
Brady	Granger	Nader
Buchanan	Hunter	Payne
Carter (TX)	Kind	Serrano
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Simpson
Evans	Lewis	Smucker
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Gabbard	Marchant	Walker

□ 1105

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader going