



“TOXIC VOTES”

VISUAL	AUDIO	FACTS
<p>CG: Air pollution can cause asthma, lung disease, cancer [American Lung Association, 6/21/2016]</p>	<p>VO: Toxins in our air can cause disease.</p>	<p>American Lung Association: Particle Pollution From Vehicle Exhaust And Power Plants Can Cause Lung Cancer, Heart Disease, And Asthma Attacks. According to the American Lung Association: "Lung cancer is the #1 cancer killer of both men and women in the U.S. When you think of risk factors for lung cancer, what comes to mind? Most of us think about the risk associated with smoking cigarettes, but did you know that air pollution can also cause lung cancer? Overwhelming evidence shows that particle pollution in the outdoor air we breathe—like that coming from vehicle exhaust, coal-fired power plants and other industrial sources—can cause lung cancer. Particle pollution increases the risk of dying early, heart disease and asthma attacks, and it can also interfere with the growth and function of the lungs." [American Lung Association, 6/21/2016]</p> <p>Volatile Organic Compounds Leaking From Natural Gas Wells Alongside Methane Can Cause Serious Health Issues Including Cancer And Birth Defects. In a 2015 story on the health effects of leaking gases in Aztec, NM, The Guardian, citing a study by University of Colorado professor Dr Detlev Helmig. The Guardian pointed out: “And it is not only methane that is leaking out of these gas wells but a host of other dangerous gasses, collectively known as volatile organic compounds (VOCs). They read like a devil’s cookbook of nastiness, for example benzene, which causes leukemia and other health problems; polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons that can cause cancer; and toluene, which is known to cause birth defects at high doses.” [The Guardian 8/14/2015]</p> <p>Citing Asthma And Lung Disease Concerns, American Lung Association President Called Repealing Ozone Standard “A Dangerous Step In The Wrong Direction.” "Delaying the process to clean up ozone pollution harms the health of millions of Americans and puts lives at risk, especially children living with asthma and others with lung disease," said Harold P. Wimmer, National President and CEO of the American Lung Association. "The EPA's job is to implement the Clean Air Act to ensure the air is safe to breathe for all, especially the most vulnerable. Stalling implementation of the 2015 ozone standard is a dangerous step in the wrong direction." [American Lung Association Press Release,</p>



		<p>7/12/2017]</p> <p>18 National Medical Organizations Criticized Efforts To Repeal The Clean Power Plan, Noting The Plan Would Have Prevented An Estimated 90,000 Pediatric Asthma Attacks And 3,600 Premature Deaths Each Year. In October of 2017, a coalition of 18 national health and medical organizations issued a joint press release, saying: "Today's proposal to revoke the Clean Power Plan is inconsistent with EPA's core mission of protecting public health and the environment. The Clean Power Plan, adopted in 2015, would have substantially reduced carbon pollution and other emissions from power plants, and prevented an estimated 90,000 pediatric asthma attacks and 3,600 premature deaths each year once fully implemented. Revoking this lifesaving plan denies Americans these health protections and removes crucial tools to reduce pollution that causes climate change." [American Public Health Association Press Release, 10/10/2017]</p> <p>Clean Power Plan Would Have Limited Sulfur Dioxide, Which Can Cause Respiratory Illnesses, Heart Disease, and Cancer. In November of 2017, The Weather Channel reported: "An Environmental Protection Agency analysis of the Obama-era Clean Power Plan found that even more lives could be saved by the climate rule than the Obama administration predicted, yet efforts to repeal the plan continue to move forward. According to the draft analysis released in October, the Clean Power Plan could, at least in one scenario, prevent up to 4,500 premature deaths per year by 2030. The rule calls for a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from power plants to help reduce global warming. An added benefit of the plan is the elimination of other harmful pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, which can cause a slew of respiratory illnesses, heart disease and cancer." [The Weather Channel, 11/2/2017]</p>
<p>CG: \$1.3 Million in contributions from big polluters opensecrets.org accessed 10/5/2018</p> <p>Voted to allow air toxins</p>	<p>Pete Sessions got campaign money from polluters, and voted to allow toxins in our air and water.</p>	<p><u>PETE SESSIONS HAS TAKEN ALMOST \$1.3 MILLION IN CAMPAIGN MONEY FROM OIL & GAS INDUSTRY</u></p> <p>Pete Sessions Has Received \$1,276,390 From The Oil And Gas Industry. According to campaign finance records compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics, Pete Sessions has received \$1,276,390 in campaign contributions from the Oil and Gas industry throughout their career. [OpenSecrets.org accessed 10/05/2018]</p>



[\[House Vote #99, 3/7/2018; House Vote #101, 3/8/2018; House Vote #488, 09/13/2017; House Vote #391, 7/18/2017; House Vote #73, 02/01/2017\]](#)

PETE SESSIONS VOTED TO ALLOW DANGEROUS TOXINS TO SPEW INTO OUR AIR AND WATER

Pete Sessions 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. Pete Sessions voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #99, 3/7/2018](#)]

Pete Sessions 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. Pete Sessions voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #101, 3/8/2018](#)]

Pete Sessions 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 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. Pete Sessions voted Yes. [[House Vote #488, 09/13/2017](#)]

Pete Sessions 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, Pete Sessions voted No. [[LCV Scorecard, House Vote #431, 7/12/2016](#)]

Pete Sessions 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. Pete Sessions voted YES. [[LCV Scorecard; House Vote #650, 12/1/2015](#)]

Pete Sessions 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. Pete Sessions votes YES. [[LCV Scorecard](#), [House Vote #391, 7/18/2017](#)]

Pete Sessions 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-borne 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. Pete Sessions voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #282, 05/24/2017](#)]

Pete Sessions 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. Pete Sessions voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #73, 02/01/2017](#)]

Pete Sessions 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.



		<p>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 approved H.R. 3354 by a vote of 211-198. The pro-environment position was NO. Pete Sessions voted Yes. [LCV Scorecard, House Vote #528, 9/14/2017]</p>
<p>CG: Sessions voted against protections for pre-existing conditions</p> <p>[House Vote 256, 5/4/17]</p>	<p>If you get ill, tough luck. He voted against protections for those with pre-existing conditions.</p>	<p>Pete Sessions Voted For The American Health Care Act That Which Would Result In 23 Million Fewer Americans With Health Insurance By 2026. In May 2017, Pete Sessions 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> <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</p>



		<p>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>Leading Patient Organizations: “People With Pre-Existing Conditions Could Be Denied Coverage.” A May 1, 2017 joint press release by the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network and 9 other patient advocacy organizations said, “Weakening protections in favor of high-risk pools would also undermine the ban on discrimination based on health status. The individuals and families we represent cannot go back to a time when people with pre-existing conditions could be denied coverage or forced to choose between purchasing basic necessities and affording their health care coverage. Given these factors, we oppose the latest draft of the AHCA. We urge Members of Congress to reject this legislation.” [American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network joint press release, 5/1/2017]</p> <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>CG: Pete Sessions. Bad For Texas</p> <p>Paid for by LCV Victory Fund,</p>	<p>Pete Sessions. Toxic votes.</p>	



<p>www.lcvvictoryfund.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.</p>		
--	--	--