

**Opening Statement of the Honorable John Shimkus  
Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy  
Hearing on “S. 1009, The Chemical Safety Improvement Act”  
November 13, 2013**

*(As Prepared for Delivery)*

Today we hold our fourth hearing of 2013 on the Toxic Substances Control Act. We welcome our witnesses, including a couple of former House guys, Senators Vitter and Udall, as well as Jim Jones, Assistant Administrator of EPA, and some of the important stakeholders in this discussion.

Until more recently, TSCA was one of the least understood federal environmental laws, but it is one of our most important environmental protection laws. It governs chemical substances, mixtures, and articles from the time they are invented all the way through the stream of commerce. Our hearings have been very instructive. They've given us a chance to dig into the nuts and bolts of this complex body of law.

Among the aspects of the law, we've studied:

- approval of new chemicals,
- regulation of existing chemicals,
- protection of confidential business information, and
- the value of a seamless, integrated U.S. market for chemicals and products that contain them.

We've gotten the perspective of:

- experts in the practice of TSCA law;
- former EPA officials experienced in what works and what doesn't work in the law's administration;
- state environmental control officials;
- downstream product manufacturers; and
- citizen activists.

As we'll hear first-hand in just a few minutes, a lot of thought and hard work has also gone into TSCA on the other side of the Capitol. Earlier this year Senator Vitter and late-Senator Frank Lautenberg with strong bipartisan support introduced S. 1009, the Chemical Safety Improvement Act. Its reforms, if enacted, would represent the most sweeping set of changes to TSCA since the Ford administration.

We're eager to learn what about this proposal brought such a diverse set of supporters together. We hope the administration and our stakeholder panel will tell us what they see as the best attributes of the legislation. We're also open to suggestions on how to make it better.

Writing legislation as complex and as important as modernizing TSCA is not easy. But implementing it may be even tougher. Congress can give EPA both the authority and direction to carry out everything in a new TSCA, but we can't just assume that the agency has the resources to accomplish all of it, nor that they'll get it all done in a short period of time after enactment.

That's why we need some guidance from Jim Jones who manages chemical regulation for EPA. And, Mr. Jones, we hope your help won't end with today's hearing.

The same goes for stakeholders, and not only the ones we'll hear from today. We need your help in understanding the real-world implications of any legislation we might consider. No one, whether on this side of the dais or at the witness table, has all the answers, but that does not mean we don't need you to give us all of your input.

And, finally, thanks to all the members of this subcommittee for your thoughtful work this year on TSCA. Have you noticed that our hearings have not been debates across the aisle, but rather non-partisan

efforts to understand current law? At times I've learned as much from questions by Mr. Tonko or Mrs. DeGette, and the answers witnesses have given him, as I have from my own.

Let's continue to embrace that same spirit as we begin to explore whether we can make federal chemical management policy better and allow the United States to lead the globe in manufacturing, smarter public health protection, and innovation.

###