



“POLLUTER IN CHIEF :30”

VISUAL	AUDIO	FACTS
<p>CG: The Polluter in Chief</p>	<p>Who can the polluter in chief count on in Washington?</p>	
<p>CG: Roskam votes with Trump 94% of the time-- FiveThirtyEight, 8/7/18</p>	<p>Peter Roskam votes with Trump 94% of the time.</p>	<p>Peter Roskam Votes With Donald Trump 94.4 Percent Of The Time. According to the blog FiveThirtyEight, which tracks the percentage of time each member of congress votes with or against the Trump administration when the administration takes a position on a vote in congress, as of September 21, 2018, Peter Roskam had voted with President Donald Trump 94.4 percent of the time. [FiveThirtyEight accessed 9/21/2018]</p>
<p>CG: Roskam Campaign: Taken \$400,000 from oil & gas Source: OpenSecrets.org</p>	<p>And he’s taken nearly four hundred thousand from big polluters.</p>	<p>Peter Roskam Has Received \$397,320 From The Oil And Gas Industry. According to campaign finance records compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics, Peter Roskam has received \$397,320 in campaign contributions from the Oil and Gas industry throughout his career. [OpenSecrets.org accessed 9/21/2018]</p>
<p>Roskam: “Called global warming ‘junk science’”—Chicago Sun-Times, 10/13/16</p>	<p>Roskam’s called climate change “junk science”...</p>	<p>Chicago Sun Times Editorial: Roskam Called Climate Change “Junk Science.” “This is a strongly Republican district, so we doubt that Democratic candidate Amanda Howland stands a chance. We endorse her nonetheless. Incumbent Rep. Peter Roskam has become a real part of the problem in Congress, compromising with Democrats on nothing of substance and bashing Obama out of sheer force of habit. He has called global warming ‘junk science,’ opposed sensible gun measures such as universal background checks for buyers, fueled the false narrative that the IRS targeted conservative groups, and emphasized border security - while articulating no other solutions - when asked what should be done to reform our immigration laws.” [Chicago Sun Times, Editorial, 10/13/2016]</p>



<p>CG: Roskam: Voted to allow more pollution House Vote #431, 7/12/2016</p>	<p>Voting to allow companies to pump more toxic pollution into our air and water.</p>	<p>Peter Roskam Voted To Block Safeguards Against Air Pollution Including Mercury, Arsenic, And Chromium From Woodstoves And Boilers. Representative Bill Johnson (R-OH) sponsored H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns (BRICK) Act of 2017, which would delay public health protections, in this case limits on deadly toxic pollution – including mercury, arsenic, and chromium – from brick manufacturing facilities. The BRICK Act was also modified in the Rules Committee to incorporate H.R. 453, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act of 2017. This bill (now section 3 of H.R. 1917) would delay stronger emission limits for new woodstoves and boilers, which reduce hazardous and toxic air pollutants – including particulate matter (soot), nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and carcinogens like benzene and formaldehyde. On March 7, the House approved H.R. 1917 by a vote of 234-180. The pro-environment position was No. Peter Roskam voted Yes. [LCV Scorecard; House Vote #99, 3/7/2018]</p> <p>Peter Roskam Voted To Exempt Waste Coal Burning Power Plants From Air Pollution Safeguards. Representative Keith Rothfus (R-PA) sponsored H.R. 1119, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment (SENSE) Act, which would permanently exempt waste coal burning power plants from meeting certain clean air standards, including limits on hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide, both of which can cause significant respiratory problems. The courts have already ruled on this matter and found that waste coal-burning power plants are already meeting these air quality standards, and there is no evidence that allowing for higher levels of pollutants would do anything but expose our communities to dirtier air. On March 8, the House approved H.R. 1119 by a vote of 215-189. The pro-environment position was No. Peter Roskam voted Yes. [LCV Scorecard; House Vote #101, 3/8/2018]</p> <p>Peter Roskam Voted To Block The EPA From Setting Limits On Methane Pollution. Representative Markwayne Mullin (R-OK) offered an amendment to H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from implementing its standards to reduce methane pollution</p>
--	---	--



from new and modified sources in the oil and gas industry. The EPA’s methane standard requires low-cost, proven safeguards that are critical to reducing methane’s contributions to climate change, with estimated climate benefits of \$170 million by 2025, and also curbs toxic air pollutants that contribute to smog and jeopardize the health of nearby communities. On September 13, the House approved the Mullin amendment by a vote of 218-195. The pro-environment position was No. Peter Roskam voted Yes. [[House Vote #488, 09/13/2017](#)]

Peter Roskam Voted To Block The Clean Power Plan. On behalf of House Energy and Commerce Committee Ranking Member Frank Pallone (D-NJ), Congressman Scott Peters (D-CA) offered an amendment to H.R. 5538, the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017, which would have struck damaging language in the bill that blocked implementation of the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan, including termination of any assistance to states that have asked for help developing sensible state policies. The Clean Power Plan establishes the first national carbon pollution limits for new and existing power plants and is the single biggest step our country has ever taken to tackle climate change. Communities across the United States are already suffering from the devastating impacts of climate change, such as more frequent and severe weather events like droughts, wildfires, floods, and storms, and unchecked climate change also threatens public health. On July 12, the House rejected the Pallone amendment by a vote of 182-244 (House roll call vote 431). The House passed H.R. 5538 on July 14, but the Senate took no action on this legislation. Yes was the pro-environment position. On Vote #431, Peter Roskam voted No. [[LCV Scorecard, House Vote #431, 7/12/2016](#)]

Peter Roskam Voted To Block The Clean Power Plan. Senator Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV) sponsored S.J. Res. 24, the Congressional Review Act "Resolution of Disapproval" that would permanently block the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Power Plan. The Clean Power Plan established the first national limits on carbon pollution from existing power plants - our nation's single largest source of the pollution fueling climate change. S.J. Res. 24 is an extreme measure that would block the biggest step our country has ever



taken to address climate change, threatening our health and our future. S.J. Res. 24 would also prohibit the EPA from ever developing "substantially similar" standards in the future. Following its passage in the Senate, on December 1, the House approved S.J. Res. 24. by a vote of 242-180 (House roll call vote 650).President Obama vetoed S.J. Res. 24 on December 18. NO was the pro-environment position. Peter Roskam voted YES. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #650, 12/1/2015](#)]

Peter Roskam Voted For An Attack on Smog Protections & the Clean Air Act. Representative Pete Olson (R-TX) sponsored H.R. 806, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017, which would delay the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) recently-updated standards for ozone pollution and eviscerate a central pillar of the Clean Air Act. This legislation would allow the EPA to consider factors unrelated to health, like technical feasibility, in the initial standard setting process. This bill would also delay the EPA’s ozone standards by at least ten years and double the current five-year review periods for updating all national air quality standards, allowing unhealthy air to persist even longer. On July 18, the House approved H.R. 806 by a vote of 229-199. The pro-environment position was NO. Peter Roskam votes YES. [[LCV Scorecard](#), [House Vote #391, 7/18/2017](#)]

Peter Roskam Voted To Eliminate Clean Water Act Safeguards Against Toxic Pesticides. Rep. Gibbs (R-OH) introduced H.R. 953, the ‘Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017,’ which would eliminate Clean Water Act safeguards protecting communities from toxic pesticides and result in pesticides being discharged directly into water bodies without any meaningful oversight or public transparency. H.R. 953 is unnecessary to address the Zika virus or other mosquito-born health threats and is simply a handout to pesticide manufacturers and other corporate interests. On May 24, the House passed H.R. 953. The pro-environment position was No. Peter Roskam voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #282, 05/24/2017](#)]

Peter Roskam Voted To Block Rules Protecting Streams From Coal Mining

Waste. Representative Bill Johnson (R-OH) sponsored H.J. Res. 38, the Congressional Review Act "Resolution of Disapproval" of the Stream Protection Rule, which would threaten the drinking water and public health of communities living near coal mining operations by permanently blocking the Department of Interior's recently finalized Stream Protection Rule. This important rule sets out commonsense requirements for coal mining that will better protect ground water, surface water, and ecosystems from toxic coal mining waste, which has been linked to increased rates of cancer, birth defects, and other health problems in nearby communities. The rule will protect 6,000 miles of streams and 52,000 acres of forests, sets up new requirements for water quality monitoring and restoration, and generally compels coal mining companies to reduce their impact on the surrounding environment. The Congressional Review Act, an extreme legislative tool, would not only overturn the current rule, but would prohibit the Department of Interior from ever issuing "substantially similar" regulations in the future that reduce the harmful impacts of coal mining, decimating the health and environment of everyone who lives near or downstream from these operations. On February 1, the House approved H.R. Res. 38 by a vote of 228-194. The pro-environment position was No. Peter Roskam voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #73, 02/01/2017](#)]

Peter Roskam Voted To Slash Funding For Environmental Protection And Undo Protections For Clean Air And Clean Water. Representative Ken Calvert (R-CA) sponsored H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, which would harm people's health and the outdoors by slashing funding for many critical programs and by using radical policy riders to outright block environmental protections. This spending bill contained damaging cuts to programs that protect public health and fuel our outdoor economy, such as the more than \$500 million cut to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the 32 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Additionally, this legislation contained a slew of anti-environmental and other ideological policy riders, including a measure that would allow the EPA to bypass the law and hide its repeal of drinking water protections for 117 million people. On September 14, the House



		<p>approved H.R. 3354 by a vote of 211-198. The pro-environment position was NO. Peter Roskam voted Yes. [LCV Scorecard, House Vote #528, 9/14/2017]</p>
<p>CG: Roskam: Voted to gut protections for pre-existing conditions House Vote #256, 5/4/17</p>	<p>Even worse, Roskam voted to gut protections for people with pre-existing conditions.</p>	<p>Peter Roskam Voted For The American Health Care Act That Which Would Result In 23 Million Fewer Americans With Health Insurance By 2026. In May 2017, Peter Roskam voted for the American Health Care Act which would have significantly repealed portions of the Affordable Care Act by cutting Medicaid, cutting taxes on the rich, removing safeguard for pre-existing conditions and defunding Planned Parenthood. The overall legislation would have in part, also according to Congressional Quarterly, “ma[d]e extensive changes to the 2010 health care overhaul law, by effectively repealing the individual and employer mandates as well as most of the taxes that finance the current system. It would [have], in 2020, convert[ed] Medicaid into a capped entitlement that would provide[d] fixed federal payments to states and end[ed] additional federal funding for the 2010 law’s joint federal-state Medicaid expansion. It would prohibit federal funding to any entity, such as Planned Parenthood, that performs abortions and receives more than \$350 million a year in Medicaid funds. [...] It would [have] allow[ed] states to receive waivers to exempt insurers from having to provide certain minimum benefits.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 217 to 213. [House Vote 256, 5/4/17; Congressional Quarterly, 5/4/17; Kaiser Family Foundation, 5/17; Congressional Actions, H.R. 1628]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation Would Allow Insurance Companies Charge Premiums Of Five To One, Instead Of Three To One, For Older To Younger Customers. According to the CBO, “Relaxing the current-law requirement that prevents insurers from charging older people premiums that are more than three times larger than the premiums charged younger people in the nongroup and small-group markets. Unless a state sets a different limit, H.R. 1628 would allow insurers to charge older people five times more than younger ones beginning in 2018.” [CBO, 5/24/17]

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>CBO: States That Opt Out Of Community Rating Protections Would Lead To Americans With Pre-Existing Conditions Being Priced Out Of The Insurance Market. According to the CBO, “Community-rated premiums would rise over time, and people who are less healthy (including those with preexisting or newly acquired medical conditions) would ultimately be unable to purchase comprehensive nongroup health insurance at premiums comparable to those under current law, if they could purchase it at all—despite the additional funding that would be available under H.R. 1628 to help reduce premiums. As a result, the nongroup markets in those states would become unstable for people with higher-than-average expected health care costs. That instability would cause some people who would have been insured in the nongroup market under current law to be uninsured.” [CBO via Vox, 5/24/17]</p> <p>GOP Health Care Plan Would Cut \$58.6 Billion In Revenue To The Medicare Trust Fund. On July 6, 2017, the Kaiser Family Foundation published an article on the Republican health care proposals’ impacts on Medicare, saying: “According to the Congressional Budget Office, the provision in the AHCA and the BCRA to repeal the Medicare payroll surtax would reduce revenue for Part A benefits by \$58.6 billion between 2017 and 2026. Proposed changes to the ACA’s marketplace coverage provisions and to Medicaid financing in both bills would also increase the number of uninsured, putting additional strain on the nation’s hospitals to provide uncompensated care. As a result, Medicare’s “disproportionate share hospital” (DSH) payments would increase, leading to higher Part A spending between 2018 and 2026 of more than \$40 billion, according to CBO. Altogether, changes to Part A spending and financing in the AHCA and BCRA would weaken Medicare’s financial status by depleting the Part A trust fund two years earlier than under current law, moving up the projected insolvency date from 2028 to 2026, according to Medicare’s actuaries.” [Kaiser Family Foundation, 6/6/2017]</p>
--	--	--



<p>CG: Roskam: Higher rates of Asthma Lung Disease Cancer American Lung Association, 6/21/16</p>	<p>Those suffering from pollution related illnesses like asthma, lung disease and cancer.</p>	<p>Current Law Under The Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) Prevents Insurance Companies From Refusing To Cover Patients With Pre-Existing Conditions Such As Asthma, Diabetes, Or Cancer. A website for the Department of Health and Human Services explains: "Under current law, health insurance companies can't refuse to cover you or charge you more just because you have a "pre-existing condition" — that is, a health problem you had before the date that new health coverage starts. These rules went into effect for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2014." According to the HHS website, "Health insurers can no longer charge more or deny coverage to you or your child because of a pre-existing health condition like asthma, diabetes, or cancer. They cannot limit benefits for that condition either. Once you have insurance, they can't refuse to cover treatment for your pre-existing condition." [HHS, About the ACA, Pre-Existing Conditions accessed 9/14/2018]</p>
<p>CG: Rep. Peter Roskam's stands with them. Not us.</p> <p>Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, www.lcvvictoryfund.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.</p>	<p>Roskam stands with them...Not us.</p>	