

Page 37, beginning on line 1, amend subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than—

“(A) \$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021; and

“(B) \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1), \$25,000,000 are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021 for grants under subsection (a) to pay for capital costs associated with the implementation of eligible treatment technologies during the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of this section.

Mrs. AXNE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentlewoman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentlewoman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have heard from many parents in my district worried about PFAS contamination in their drinking water. PFAS are manmade chemicals that can pose serious health risks and are of great concern to my constituents.

In large quantities, PFAS are dangerous and deadly to human health, and these forever chemicals are going to take a lot of work and innovation to clean up. These chemicals have been linked to cancer, effects on the immune system, and impaired child development.

While PFAS chemicals have not been found in the water supply in my district, there is a known contamination site. Our community has stepped up and is working together through a PFAS Working Group to address this contamination and conduct further testing, but it is past time that the Federal Government steps in, stops the production of these dangerous chemicals, requires cleanup, and provides resources to ensure that our communities aren't left to fight this alone.

Our public water utilities provide a critical service to our communities by ensuring families have safe and clean drinking water. However, without proper support, many water utilities won't be able to afford the necessary upgrades or would be forced to put the costs back on the backs of their community.

I am glad that this legislation creates a grant program to provide funding for water utilities to upgrade their drinking water systems in order to effectively remove PFAS. The PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program will ensure utilities have the resources they

need to protect our water systems without burdening the communities they serve with an unaffordable expense.

However, as the bill is written now, the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program would only be authorized for 2 years. Our communities need more flexibility and time when deciding the best way to upgrade their water infrastructure and to combat PFAS.

My amendment would extend the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program for an additional 3 years, allowing water utilities time to properly address their needs, test their water, and request funding, as necessary.

Additionally, my amendment would increase the funding available by \$300 million over that 3-year period. By more than doubling the current authorized amount, my amendment would ensure there are enough funds available so utilities can afford these necessary upgrades without negatively impacting the critical work that they do.

My State of Iowa also has many rural drinking water systems that don't have the scale to afford massive infrastructure costs. We see, time and time again, that smaller water systems are unable to remove hazardous and dangerous materials simply because of cost barriers. I am pleased that the underlying bill prioritizes small drinking water systems, and my amendment ensures the program has enough funding so no community is left behind.

This legislation is an important step to ensure Iowa families have access to safe drinking water without these harmful PFAS chemicals. My amendment strengthens the PFAS Infrastructure Grant Program, and I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. Chairman, 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.

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support of the amendment. I am glad there is bipartisan support to ensure that our communities have the drinking water and resources they need to protect that.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague. I rose in opposition, just so she understands that I will be speaking in opposition to the amendment. I appreciate the kind words.

Mr. Chair, I wish she would have been here when the Rice amendment was on the floor, which has been passed and added to the bill, which would now allow the rich communities that have already paid for their modifications at great expense to be able to dip back into these funds at the expense of rural communities. That was an amendment we passed earlier.

Mr. Chair, under this legislation, EPA is supposed to issue a national primary drinking water standard for PFAS, but PFOA and PFOS at a minimum. Once this is done, communities that are disadvantaged—and I am from rural Illinois, 33 counties—one, assistance for installing technology are eligible for the drinking water State-revolving loan programs.

This amendment creates a double-dipping opportunity for communities when the main focus of the Safe Drinking Water Act State revolving fund is to help struggling systems meet the mandate it imposes to protect public health.

More practically, because of budget allocations that the House appropriators are supposed to operate under, increased capitalization grants will suffer. Money, to the tune of \$75 million, will be diverted to this particular PFAS grant program at the expense of the State revolving fund.

Communities, especially rural communities, not only with PFAS but other compliance and health problems as well, could and will likely be a loser, so that is why I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BRINDISI, 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

IMPEACHMENT HOLD

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt that last month's impeachment vote was purely political, there shouldn't be now.

Throughout the partisan impeachment inquiry, we were told that it was critical to move quickly because the threat of waiting was too great. The Schiff report even said: “We cannot wait.”

In the interest of speed, any hope of fairness was discarded. Rules were broken. Democrats couldn't wait on a minority hearing, breaking House rules

that afforded us that right. Democrats couldn't wait on the courts to obtain additional testimony. But Speaker PELOSI continues to hold the articles from the Senate in an attempt to dictate the terms of the trial to Leader McCANNON.

The Constitution grants the Senate the sole power to try all impeachments, not the Speaker.

Democrats voted to impeach the President for abuse of power and claim he is a threat to the Constitution, but look at what you are doing. You are trying to take the Senate's constitutional power for your own political gain.

Follow the Constitution you spoke so much about. Transmit the articles to the Senate so that they can undertake their constitutional responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRINDISI). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

IN CELEBRATION OF GEORGE STEVENS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise to celebrate a dear man in northern California from the town of Palo Cedro in Shasta County. George Stevens celebrated his 100th birthday on December 28.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being able to stop by and spend time with George and his family at the event at the Palo Cedro Community Center, to celebrate with him and recognize, also, his service to our country, which is pretty amazing.

George is a Pearl Harbor survivor. He was there in the Army at the base there during the Pearl Harbor attack. Later, if that wasn't enough, he ended up being deployed to Europe, where he was at the Normandy invasion later on in 1944. And if that wasn't enough, a few months later in the winter, he fought at the Battle of the Bulge.

None of us would have the freedom we have if it weren't for people like George and all of his comrades who were there in that war preserving freedom for us and so many others with that sacrifice.

He is a true patriot, a great American, and he is a guy that still drives and does his home repairs around his place there in Palo Cedro.

Mr. Speaker, we are really proud of George and wish him a happy birthday. I am glad I got to spend time with him and his family.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 34 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the statement that was

just made about BRIAN FITZPATRICK, I will be missing tomorrow's votes. If I were here, I would vote "no." There is too much good that is being done with the PFAS, and I would vote "no."

But I will be attending the funeral of a former Member of Congress, a great patriot, a friend, just a wonderful person, Michael Fitzpatrick, and it was an honor to serve with him in this body.

Obviously, we have had a lot of discussion about Iran, Soleimani, his death, the death of so many that he caused, and his role in being head of the IRGC, so I thought it would be helpful if we learned a little more for those who haven't.

It helps, I found, profoundly, if people know what they are talking about, and it seems there has been a whole lot of talking and not a lot of knowledge about what is going on with Iran.

Many of us remember, and I sure remember because I was in the Army at Fort Benning at the time, when our Embassy in Tehran was attacked initially, it was said by the Iranian leaders that the students attacked the Embassy; and after days of President Carter doing nothing but begging for them to let our people go, they realized that we were not going to do anything, and so they began to say: We have the hostages.

I always thought at the time, paying close attention to the news back in those days, that by saying the students did this that the Iranian leaders were giving themselves a back door if we had had a President who had put his foot down and said: Either you get them released, or we are going to come get them released ourselves; and if they are harmed, Iran will pay heavily.

I felt that was probably where they would say: Hey, we got them from the students. Here they are.

But that was the first clue after Vietnam that we were still a paper tiger. That is the way we were portrayed around the world. That is what we in the Army heard back in those days: Gee, all you have to do is drag out confrontation like Vietnam and they will turn tail and run.

That appeared to be consistent with us doing nothing about our Embassy, which, under international law, is American soil. It is American property. It is American housing. It was attacked, and we didn't do anything about it for a lengthy time, which sent the message to the new leader in Iran, the Ayatollah Khomeini, that we really were paper tigers. We were toothless. There was no power, no courage, and it encouraged them.

□ 2130

In fact, there was one effort at a rescue but, unfortunately, the military's hands were tied by people at the top.

I was told by a friend in the Army back at the time that the White House was the one that had them cut back the number of helicopters that would go into the desert across, around 500 miles or so of desert, with turbine en-

gines in the helicopters. And they knew, as my friend, General Boykin has confirmed, they had to get six to the landing area. Otherwise, it was an abort. And when it was clear only 5 were going to make it, that the mission was aborted.

The helicopter pilot may have gotten vertigo. The helicopter tilted. The blade went through a C-130 that was there to equip them for the trip in to rescue our hostages, and Americans were killed and left there in the desert at the staging area.

If there had been an adequate number of helicopters allowed to go in, they would have had sufficient number of six or more to make it. But the number going in was cut back, I was told, by the White House. They didn't want it to look like an invasion.

I am proud we have got a President that is not worried about it. I mean, I have asked him about this before, and he is more concerned about protecting our American treasure, our American military members; and he wants to commit whatever our military needs to get the job done. That is a far cry from where we were in the late 1970s.

In fact, I do recall President Carter, he had turned his back on the Shah. It didn't sound like the Shah was a great person, a great humanitarian at all, but at least Iran and the area were not at war with us at that time.

But when President Carter turned his back on the Shah, it opened the door for him to be overthrown. Apparently, people in the Carter White House did not give adequate thought to what happens when the Shah is gone, because what happened was the Ayatollah Khomeini.

And President Carter, as I recall, welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini back in charge of Iran—he had not been in charge before—but welcomed him back to Iran, and proclaimed he was a man of peace. It could not have been a more ignorant welcome to the man that would start Iran on the course to be the greatest source of terrorism in the world.

So thank you very much to the Carter administration. Great job. You brought in, allowed in people who have continued to kill Americans at a rate greater than anybody else.

They have helped Afghanistan. That was a shock when we found that out. They have helped Sunnis, they have helped Shia. And normally, that doesn't happen, but they are so dedicated to destroying the Great Satan, America, in their view, and destroying the Little Satan, Israel, that we have to take them seriously. Too many Americans have been killed as a result of ignorance or optimism unjustified.

But this is a study done from the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, a very good study done, and it gives us a lot of information about Iran. It points out that Iranian military action, often working through proxies, uses terrorist tactics; has led to the death of well over 1,000 American soldiers in Iraq and