

America stopped apologizing for its interests and started asserting them.

At the time, the American left excoeriated Reagan. They warned his policies would lead the Nation to starvation and the world to conflagration. Instead, we enjoyed a period of American prosperity and world influence that was best described with the words "morning again in America." He reduced the tax and regulatory burdens that were crushing America's economy. He reduced government spending as a percentage of GDP. He restored America's military strength and reasserted American interests around the world. He stopped apologizing for America's greatness and started celebrating it.

It was recalled earlier that in his farewell address Reagan attributed his success not to being a great communicator, but to the fact he was communicating great ideas, the self-evident truths of the American founding. He did one other thing. He restored those self-evident truths as the foundation of our domestic and foreign policy, and as a result our Nation prospered and the world enjoyed a rebirth of freedom.

Unfortunately, Reagan's successors gradually abandoned his policies and Americans gradually let loose of those self-evident truths that inspired and animated those policies. But now as our Nation endures prolonged economic distress at home and increasing strife abroad, Americans are beginning to realize that our Nation hasn't been struck down by some mysterious act of God. What has happened to our country is because of specific acts of government, and, as Reagan knew, acts of government are fully within our power to change.

Reagan charted the road back. Our Nation followed him down that road and we discovered that, yes, it does indeed lead to a shining city on a hill. As we remember Ronald Reagan, all that he was and all that he stood for, let's also remember what he did and where he led us. It isn't too late to return to those policies and get back on that road.

Mr. Speaker, I want my children to know what morning again in America actually feels like. I want them to know the optimism that America's best days are yet ahead, and to know the pride and confidence of American exceptionalism. On this centennial of Ronald Reagan's birth, let's not just remember him; let's follow his example and get our Nation back on the road to freedom. And let those looking back on our generation say that just when it began to appear that our Nation had forgotten Ronald Reagan and squandered its wealth and abandoned its destiny and forsaken its founding principles, that this generation of Americans rediscovered, restored and revived the memory of Ronald Reagan and the promise of the American founding, and that from that moment in time, America began her next great era of expansion, prosperity and influence.

□ 2020

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful contribution and his dedication to the Reagan cause. As we think about where we are today, I said at the library the other night that I was privileged to be part of the Reagan revolution, having been elected with President Reagan in 1980. But thanks to the 87 newly elected Members who have joined us, I said what a privilege it is to be a part of the Reagan revolution, because I think that it does continue.

If we look at just foreign policy, again, the fact is that Ronald Reagan, in a very famous speech that he delivered in the early 1980s at Westminster talked about the need to develop the infrastructure, foster the infrastructure of democracy around the world. And he established the National Endowment for Democracy, which has made great strides in expanding the rule of law, political pluralism, the development of self-determination of democratic institutions around the world. And this is a war of ideas that will continue to this very day. It is a war of ideas that consists of that struggle. It's peace and prosperity through freedom and democracy versus oppression and poverty bred of violence and hatred.

And I believe that we can, in fact, win this war of ideas if we do get back to the core principles of Ronald Reagan. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, the museum has reopened, and I want to encourage our colleagues to take the opportunity to visit this amazing, amazing facility, which I know will bring back memories for every single American who was alive during the Reagan years, and it clearly will be a model for future generations.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CLEAR AIR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. This evening, Mr. Speaker, we will be joined by a number of colleagues in the House to discuss

the Clean Air Act and its impact on jobs, on public health, and our national security. It is interesting to note that we've had an outstanding 40-year record on behalf of the improvements that have come via the Clean Air Act, and now there are forces amongst us that would like to repeal important pollution control standards that are part of that Clean Air Act and roll backward the very progress that we have enjoyed, the impact that it has made. And they're being joined now, these forces, by big polluters, people who would choose to have us go backward and undo the tremendous standards that have brought about and enhanced quality of life.

Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has saved hundreds of thousands of lives and decreased air pollution by some 60 percent, at the same time having grown our economy by some 200 percent. So it is very important to note that there has been a high order of progress associated with the Clean Air Act, which came, by the way, through bipartisan vision that thought we could improve our situation here in America, and those visionaries were absolutely correct.

We now are at risk of endangering our children's health simply by attacking the health standards that the Clean Air Act promotes. We're also at risk of promoting ideas that will denounce innovation—innovation that has moved forward in breaking our gluttonous dependency on oil, oftentimes imported from unfriendly nations to the United States, and where also we will roll back the progress that has come with creating our own sense of innovation as we have responded to these cleanup measures here in the States. This is an important juncture. After a 40-year record, 40 years of success, we're now faced with the forces of big polluters hooking up with our colleagues in the majority in this House looking to roll back progress and denounce policies that have impacted us favorably.

We're joined this evening by a number of colleagues. We're joined by Representative QUIGLEY from the Fifth District of Illinois, who has thoughts that he wants to share with us. We'll be hearing from a number of colleagues from Virginia and Washington State as the hour continues to roll.

Representative QUIGLEY, thank you for joining us this evening on this very important topic and on this very important effort to hold back any efforts made to undo the law and weaken it and put our health standards at risk.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Well, I want to thank you so much for having me. I want to thank my colleague from New York for his efforts and everyone who's here tonight toward this end. This issue is critical not just to our health, our Nation's health, but also to our country's national security and our economy. Because I rise today to protect the integrity of all things of science because it is science that these facts and figures that have led hundreds of scientists to

confirm that global warming is real. It is this science that led the Supreme Court through jurisprudence to rule that the EPA does in fact have the authority to regulate greenhouse gases. And it is this science that led the Congress to pass the Clean Air Act, the act which designated the EPA as the body charged with overseeing, adapting, and implementing these regulations.

In the coming months, the EPA will begin regulating greenhouse gases from certain emitters for the first time. These regulations have become hugely controversial and, sadly, political. These rules combat man-made climate change—man-made climate change that is melting our polar ice caps, that is raising the level of our oceans, and that is modifying our seasonal temperatures; man-made climate change that is altering the duration of our growing season, that is flooding parts of the world and causing multi-year droughts on others; man-made climate change that is allowing particulate matters to infiltrate our children's lungs, making them suffer from lifelong asthma and making us die earlier.

But some would argue these rules, these new regulations, are burdensome; that they kill jobs, they imperil economic recovery, they are nonsensical, they aren't pragmatic. That is nonsensical.

Let's take EPA's proposed rule regarding toxic emission from industrial boilers, a seemingly innocuous rule, right? Wrong. This rule called for the cleanup of units that burn fuel onsite to provide electricity and heat. This action, this rule, would cut mercury particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and acid gases by requiring facilities to install equipment to clean up these toxic emissions. This so-called "job-killing rule" would, as predicted, save from 2,000 to 5,000 lives each year. The need to crack down on greenhouse gases is based on sound science, the results of hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific studies that say that global warming is real and that man contributes to it.

And if you're keeping score at home, there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that say that global warming is not real and that man does not contribute to it. But, more than that, the need to crack down on greenhouse gas emissions, the need to give EPA the tools to do its duty as mandated by Congress and deemed their responsibility by the Supreme Court. This issue certainly is lethal. It kills people. And my friends who oppose this radical fight against global warming, you can't work if you're dead.

December 31, 2010, marked the 40th anniversary of the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act has saved the lives of over 160,000 people, as conservatively estimated by the EPA. This issue then is a public health issue.

Chicago is my hometown. It is in the midst of a public health crisis. We are the morbidity and mortality capital of the United States for asthma. Having

two children who face this ailment, it strikes near and dear to home. We are dealing with skyrocketing rates of death due to asthma, but we're not the only city with this problem. A report released by the American Lung Association reported nearly 60 percent of Americans live in areas where air pollution has reached unhealthy levels that can and does make people sick.

□ 2030

Yet we are standing here on the House floor arguing against job preserving measures, measures that will keep us alive and able to work, measures that will create jobs in clean and green industrial areas.

As Al Gore said in 2005, "It is now clear that we face a deepening global climate crisis that requires us to act boldly, quickly and wisely." Attacks on the Clean Air Act and the EPA's ability to regulate greenhouse gases are a huge piece of the larger climate crisis, a crisis that has a hefty cost—our health and our lives.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative QUIGLEY, for presenting your perspective on this important discussion.

I think it's important to note when we talk about the statistics, when we talk about an attack on public health standards, which this is, it's done to enhance the opportunities—for lobbyists, for special interests, for deep pockets of the oil industry, where they want to avoid that sense of accountability and where they want to build their profit column at the expense of the health outcomes that we have generated to the good over the last 40 years. In fact, in 2010 alone, the stat is that some 160,000 lives plus were saved by this legislation, by this law that was produced 40 years ago. And when it comes to children, some 18 million cases over the last 20 years of children's bronchial or respiratory illnesses were prevented. So right there the proof is in the pudding. This is an attack on our public health, and I think it's important to state it for the record so that when these forces of negativity come into play, they're checked for their wanting to roll us backward.

I thank you for joining us this evening, Representative QUIGLEY.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you for having me.

Mr. TONKO. We are joined by Representative GERRY CONNOLLY from the 11th District in Virginia. It is always good to hear from you, also, GERRY.

It is important, I think, that everyone share their perspective here this evening of what damage can be calculated here after 40 years of progress and where there is an attack on our health care standards and on job creation. Because, as we all know, innovation to respond to the efforts of this law, the intent purpose, produces jobs and produces a technical response that is unique and provides for America to dig deep into solutions.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. My friend from New York is absolutely

right. Let me thank him for his leadership in taking up this Special Order tonight on the all-important preservation of the Clean Air Act. I can't think frankly of a more reckless idea than repeal of all or parts of the Clean Air Act. It would transform the quality of life for all Americans.

Our colleague from Illinois' comments about having children who live in Chicago, the number one asthma affected municipality in the United States, really resonates with me. I also have a close relative here in the Nation's capital, I represent the suburbs of Washington, DC, and I can tell you that as a nonattainment region, we have significant health effects from our air pollution. We are a nonattainment region as measured by the Environmental Protection Agency, and cleaning up our air quality is critical to thousands of people and thousands of children whose health depends on the efficacy of the Clean Air Act and making sure it is fully implemented.

I wanted just to share with my friend from New York and my colleagues tonight some of the costs of repealing the Clean Air Act, because I think Americans need to focus on that. It's not cost-free to repeal this all-important environmental piece of legislation. Thanks to the Clean Air Act, Americans will see gas consumption of cars reduced by an average of 30 percent, saving the average car owner over \$2,000. That would be lost. Repealing the Clean Air Act would increase OPEC imports by 72 million barrels every year by 2020. Repealing the Clean Air Act will force Americans to spend \$9.9 billion each year to Libya and Venezuela and other OPEC countries, not all of which have America's best interests at heart. Repealing the Clean Air Act would forgo savings for Americans of 77 billion gallons of fuel over the life of the vehicles sold in those years, representing \$240 billion in benefits, including over \$182 billion in fuel savings.

In addition to undermining national security, repealing the Clean Air Act would cause thousands of premature deaths which my colleagues were referring to. For example, the proposed EPA boiler MACT standard would save from 2,000 to 5,100 lives each year. Those lives would not be saved with repeal of the Clean Air Act.

A report released by the American Lung Association recently reported that nearly 60 percent of all Americans live in areas where air pollution has reached unhealthy levels that can and do make people sick, including right here in the Nation's capital. Approximately 171,632 children and 544,013 adults have asthma in my home State of Virginia alone, according to the American Lung Association. Repealing EPA's authority to limit mercury, particulate matter, carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide pollution would increase those numbers significantly and would aggravate already existing respiratory conditions. We cannot afford to repeal the Clean Air Act when it

would imperil public health, undermine national security, countermand all of our goals in terms of energy independence, and set a dangerous precedent for repealing our most important public health law.

I thank my colleague from New York for leading us tonight and highlighting the risks involved, the very serious and real risks involved in this reckless action that is proposed.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative CONNOLLY. We will continue to banter here this evening about the merits of the Clean Air Act and the good that it has produced. But when we talk about some of this innovation, how we can drive our energy independence, our self-sufficiency, it goes well beyond the public health efforts that can be secured simply by that kind of work as we reduce the amount of emissions, but it also turns into an issue of national security, where we know sending these over \$400 billion a year to foreign sources for our oil importation is actually feeding the treasuries of some very unfriendly nations to the U.S., and then perhaps having those dollars used to train the troops that are fighting our troops in our efforts for peace in the Mideast. It is a never ending cycle of madness that has to be prevented, and I think the Clean Air Act, accompanied by other efforts that we can do to spur jobs and create an innovation economy are very important aspects. They are outcomes of sound progressive legislation that then achieves wonderful results and allows us to address public health standards in a way that is magnanimous.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. My colleague could not be more correct. And, of course, as he recalls, not only sound progressive legislation but sound environmental legislation that had broad bipartisan support and was signed into law by a Republican President.

Mr. TONKO. Right. And produced great benefits for every dollar invested. You, Representative CONNOLLY, and I serve on SEEC, which is a wonderful group of legislators, like-minded in producing a green agenda that reaches to a sustainable energy and environmental outcome. That SEEC coalition is what is driving that agenda here in the House. One of our cochairs is with us this evening, the gentleman from Washington State's First District, JAY INSLEE. Representative JAY INSLEE is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and is ranker on a subcommittee, I believe, that will have a very important hearing.

Representative INSLEE, thank you for joining us this evening to talk about this important topic.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you. I can't think of anything more important.

Tomorrow we will have the first hearing in Congress on the Dirty Air Act. Of course the Dirty Air Act is the act that intends to gut Uncle Sam's ability to protect clean air for all of us to breathe—Republicans, Democrats and independents. This Dirty Air Act is

clearly bad for children with asthma. This Dirty Air Act is bad for senior men with respiratory problems. This Dirty Air Act is bad for senior American women with heart problems. This Dirty Air Act is bad for American workers who are going to lose the jobs that will be created in the innovative new industries that we're going to build so we can produce electricity and power for our cars in a clean way. This Dirty Air Act is one of the worst pieces of legislation I have seen in my time in the U.S. Congress and I will tell you why. It breaks faith with some of the values, at least two of the great works done by Republican Presidents. And it's really a tragedy that my colleagues across the aisle have fallen for the siren sound of the polluters, because it's the polluters who want to pass the Dirty Air Act, which by the way you could also call the Inhaler Enhancement Act of 2011, if you want to know what it does to children who have asthma.

We just spent an hour talking about the optimism of President Ronald Reagan, which was manifest and appreciated by Democrats and Republicans alike. And those of us who stand against this Dirty Air Act believe we ought to have optimism that we can create electricity in clean ways. We can do it in solar energy created and powered by Americans. We can do it with electric cars made by Americans. The GM Volt was just the car of the year made by Americans, General Motors; a plug-in electric hybrid car.

□ 2040

We can do it with wind. We can do it, perhaps, with advanced forms of nuclear power.

The point is that that sense of optimism has now been shucked overboard because the polluters have come up to Washington, DC, with their lobbyist friends, and have convinced our friends and colleagues to throw aside 40 years of Republican success. This thing was started by Richard Nixon with a good assist by William Ruckelshaus, who is now a citizen of Seattle, Washington. It was a Republican who recognized our ability to innovate in a way that would grow jobs and reduce air pollution.

I want to leave you with one statistic—and Richard Nixon was right in this regard. He was wrong on some other things, but he was right on this.

He said the polluting industry resisted the Clean Air Act when it started 40 years ago, but what he believed—and it turned out to be accurate—was that we could innovate our way to create new technologies to produce energy. That's why we have reduced air pollution by 60 percent since 1970. It is because of the Clean Air Act. Yet our economy has grown by 200 percent—a 200 percent growth at the time the polluters said this was going to wreck the U.S. economy. That's the same thing we can do now in using the innovative talents so we can start making electric cars here and ship them to China, so we

can start making solar panels here, with jobs in America, so we can ship those to China.

I'll just part with one statement.

There ought not to be any debate about the health care impacts here either. Congress has received a letter signed by 2,505 American scientists, calling on Congress to resist and defeat the Republicans' dirty air act, because, it says, the Clean Air Act is a science-based law that has prevented 400,000 premature deaths and hundreds of millions of cases of respiratory and cardiovascular disease during the 40 years since it was first passed, all without diminishing economic growth.

Those are from American scientists, who understand American innovation, who understand American asthma, who understand the American ability to keep moving forward and to not go backwards. Heaven help those who would support the dirty air act and who would support to repeal clean air protections for Americans.

Mr. TONKO. Representative INSLEE, you talk about the jobs effect. Obviously, there are those who would suggest that this kills jobs when, in fact, we have data from 2007 that shows the air pollution control equipment industry was generating some \$18.3 billion with \$3 billion of that in terms of exporting that is done.

So this spurs innovation. It puts into working order the science and tech community that creates sustainable-type jobs that really make an impact on our quality of life and on our public health standards. I think those facts are missing here when those forces of lobbyists, deep pocket sorts, and oil voices join with our partners on the other side of the aisle to kill this legislation.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, I have a little story about how I've seen this firsthand.

I went to the coolest event a few weeks ago that I've ever gone to as a public official. It was in Woodinville, Washington, at the Woodinville Wooden Cross Church. I got to participate in the benediction, in the dedication, of the very first electric car charging station at a church in America. It was great. It was, you know, let there be light and there was light. Let there be power and there was power. More importantly, there were jobs, because every time we put in one of these charging stations, there are five American jobs created due to these investments.

If the Republicans get their way, what will happen is they will repeal the Clean Air Act, which will affect carbon and methane and ozone—very dangerous gasses in a lot of different ways. Instead of the investment going to create new energy industries, those investments are going to go to China, and it's China that is going to make the electric cars and the solar power and the advanced systems of maybe finding ways to burn coal cleanly.

We don't want to give that competitive advantage up. This is the pedal to the metal, this Clean Air Act, which drives the investment which has made America the leading producer of scrubbing equipment in the world today to clean up these stacks today. This is what makes us competitive. So I think this is a job killer to pass the dirty air act, and we've got to get in this race with China.

Mr. TONKO. You know, I think, too, it taps into the pioneer spirit of America—the ingenuity, the creative genius that has always guided us, that is nurtured simply by our open system of government and capitalist style of opportunity. We have been able to go forward with so many advances. In this case, as we address health-threatening, life-threatening situations because of toxic poisoning, it produces jobs that are of a very sustainable quality and that are really tapping into the cerebral power of this country. I don't know why anyone would want to disrupt that progress as there is no higher priority than jobs, jobs, jobs in our society today.

At the same time, if we can create stronger public health standards—as you said, address women of senior age varieties and children of all types and working middle-aged couples around this country—everyone in every age demographic will be protected and helped by the Clean Air Act. There is 40 years of documented success that ought to guide us here and tell us this is a move in the wrong direction.

We are so happy that so many people are offering their thoughts here this evening in this Special Order, in this 1-hour's worth of info exchange. We are joined by a great Representative from New Jersey, who is, again, a very thoughtful scientist of types—a physicist, I believe—from New Jersey's 12th Congressional District, Representative RUSH HOLT.

Thank you so much, Representative HOLT, for joining us this evening.

Mr. HOLT. I would like to add a comment to Mr. INSLEE's point and just repeat: Pollution is costly. It's costly in lives and it's costly in dollars, and one of the best instruments that has existed in the world over the past 40 years is the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act has decreased lead emissions by 95 percent. In using the Clean Air Act, the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, has reduced emissions from diesel engines by almost 90 percent, and that is saving lives and saving dollars. By phasing out ozone-depleting chemicals and working through international agreements, the EPA is cutting non-melanoma skin cancer by hundreds of millions, and reducing smog and soot reduces premature deaths. This is successful legislation.

My colleague, Mr. INSLEE, what do we call it? You were calling it the “dirty air act.”

Mr. INSLEE. I think it's simply fair to call it the “dirty air act” because

that's what you get if this legislation passes. You get dirty air. If you pass a dirty air act, you get dirty air. I think it's a fair assessment of what it does.

Mr. HOLT. Undoing the Clean Air Act makes the air less clean. The Clean Air Act has been successful in reducing into the atmosphere the emissions of pollutants/chemicals that kill people. The Clean Air Act has been successful.

And what do we have before us?

Well, tomorrow, as you say, there will be a hearing on legislation not yet in final form—let's hope that it never finds its way into final form. It is legislation that would gut the Clean Air Act. It would prevent the Clean Air Act from keeping up with the times. It would prevent the Clean Air Act from continuing to protect Americans by removing dangerous chemicals from the atmosphere. This is really a matter of public health, and it is also a matter of economics.

The cost of clean air safeguards has been exaggerated over the years. I remember—and I think my colleagues are old enough to remember. I certainly am—when the Clean Air Act was passed. At the time, they said, Oh, this is going to be terrible. It's going to ruin industry. You know, claims about the cost of sulphur dioxide standards were exaggerated by factors of—I don't know—5 or 10.

□ 2050

You know, we've seen from the market price of the sulfur dioxide allowances that the actual market is much less than the estimated cost of complying with the sulfur dioxide regulations. So, again and again, these have been exaggerated, and by implementing the Clean Air Act, we have saved lives and, by association, by extension, saved dollars.

Furthermore, if the Clean Air Act is allowed to continue to look after the air that you and I breathe, it will lead to further efficiency and all of the burgeoning industries that you, my colleague from New York, and you, my colleague from Washington, have talked about. This is going to be very good for the United States to be able to sell these environmentally attractive technologies to the rest of the world rather than to buy them.

So, for all sorts of reasons, we simply cannot afford the proposal of what's coming from the majority on the other side of the aisle that would increase our dependence on foreign oil, that would leave the air less breathable, that would aggravate asthma and heart disease, and would end up undoing the Clean Air Act. What Congress should be doing is making it possible for the Clean Air Act to continue to protect Americans' health and lives, not undoing it.

Mr. INSLEE. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HOLT. I'd be happy to.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. HOLT made a really important point that we need to discuss. He made a strong statement that

this dirty air act that the Republicans have introduced would gut the Clean Air Act. That is a strong statement, and it is entirely accurate.

Mr. HOLT. If I may explain, the Clean Air Act is based on science.

Mr. INSLEE. Yeah.

Mr. HOLT. And the Clean Air Act, as the years have gone by, has used the best science to find the best ways to remove the worst pollutants from our air, and this is a very unscientific approach that they're saying. They're saying because of politics we are not going to listen to science; because of politics, we're going to say the Clean Air Act stops here.

Mr. INSLEE. What I want to make clear to the public is that when we say gut, we mean gut the Clean Air Act because the Republican dirty air act doesn't just reduce protections by 10 percent to children with asthma. It doesn't reduce it by 50 percent. It entirely eliminates the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide kids with asthma any protection whatsoever for these listed emissions from polluting industries.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. And you know, I think that our goal, gentlemen, should be to strengthen the public health standards. When we think of the reduced amount of impacts on children, for instance, those 18 million cases that were prevented of respiratory diseases for children, those are important steps. That ought to drive us.

But you know, Representative HOLT talked about the cost of the program and the associated benefits. Well, right now the average has been for every dollar of investment there is a \$13 benefit. That's a tremendous, powerful outcome. Why would we not want to continue that sort of benefit that befalls the American public and produces jobs at the same time? This whole session of Congress that preceded this 112th and now this Congress, this session of Congress to date is all about jobs, and why would we walk away from the jobs potential and the public health improvements for the sake of politics? And by the way, those benefits are projected by the year 2020 to rise to \$20 trillion, which is a 30:1 ratio. For every dollar invested, \$30 of benefits will be produced. This is an awesome track record, and one that really, again, speaks to the well-being, the general health of the American public and produces jobs.

By the way, the American manufacturing teams that work on air pollution reduction technology are the kingpins in that global market. They are producing and exporting. Now, everywhere we go we're looking for American industry to be bolstered, for manufacturing to come back. We in this House have adopted the mantra, Make it in America, Make it in America again. Here we are, we're achieving and exporting, exporting, which is the goal here, so that we can bulk up the American economy, and getting good results from it.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield on that very point.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. HOLT. The rest of the world is not backing down. The rest of the world is not moving toward dirtier atmosphere, toward more atmospheric admissions. They understand that this is deadly and costly, and as I said a few moments ago, wouldn't it be better if we Americans were selling the technologies to the rest of the world? Many of these technologies were developed here in the United States. Many of the opportunities for more energy efficiency and less atmospheric admissions can be developed here in the United States. Wouldn't it be better if we developed them here and sold them to the rest of the world instead of someday having to buy them?

Mr. TONKO. There's a point that comes to mind, Representative HOLT, when you talk about building it here and developing the technology and having that think-tank quality in this country. That also has to be nurtured by the next generation of workers. We have to pull from the students in the classroom today their experience or their awareness of science, technology, engineering, and math. We must enable them to explore those areas as a career path.

What sort of message are we offering out there? What is the message that resonates from this sort of approach? If I'm a youngster in a classroom, I'm thinking science and technology has no value in our society. We're able to clean up, but we don't want to clean up. We're able to produce jobs through air pollution reduction technology that requires some sort of research and development concept—we don't care about that.

We're sending a message to young people that these careers don't matter, and oh, by the way, your health doesn't matter because all of those young people, say from asthma or say from some sort of respiratory ailment, just don't matter. That is a terrible statement to offer our young people, I would think. And Representative INSLEE, you have something to say?

Mr. HOLT. I would urge you to put your comment in the conditional. This is not going to happen. We are not going to let it happen. It would be so unwise to say we're not going to follow the science. It would be so unwise to say to the young people, we're going to turn away from this innovative challenge. It would be so unwise to say to families with asthma, we're not going to make the atmosphere better.

Mr. TONKO. Just following on the heels of—

Mr. HOLT. It's not going to happen but, we are here to say we won't let it happen.

Mr. TONKO. Just following on the heels of the President saying right from the podium, right in the State of the Union, it's time to celebrate the science bowl as much as we celebrate the Super Bowl. Here he is trying to

draw the innovation economy into the classroom to give students a sense of vision, partake in a creative venture out there that will make the world better, and now we're rolling back technology. What a terrible message to leave our young people.

Representative INSLEE.

Mr. INSLEE. You just may be thinking, President Obama gave a State of the Union. He talked about celebrating winning the science bowl, about using the Chinese advances, and how clean energy is our Sputnik moment, so that we would be called to have a new Apollo energy project, and we know we can do in clean energy what our, you know, ancestors did in space, which is to lead the world in clean energy. We know this can be the American destiny, and the reason we know that is because our vision is one based on optimism and confidence. Our vision is that we know we can invent new forms of energy so that we don't cause additional asthma problems in our children.

□ 2100

Now this is a difference between us and the Republicans who want to pass this dirty air act. We realize two things about our children. Number one, when polluters pollute and expose them to dangerous levels of ozone and increase—dramatic increases—in asthma attacks and respiratory problems in senior citizens, those kids don't have anywhere to run and hide. You know, an oil company can go around places in the world. A kid is stuck where he lives, and there's nowhere to hide from dirty air. That's why I'm not very happy about this effort to put more of our kids in the way of dirty air, number one.

And number two, we realized that this is real when it comes to new technology. You know, when we passed the bill to create an investment in lithium ion battery manufacturing plants this year, some of our Republican colleagues scoffed at that effort. They thought, This is never going to happen. Well, in Holland, Michigan, we have laid-off American auto workers now making lithium ion batteries, or shortly, for sale all around the world to power electric cars.

We know there are jobs to make that happen. We know in Seattle, Washington, we've got the leaders in the discovery of location for wind power. We know those jobs can be made to happen. In Moses Lake, Washington, we have one of the largest manufacturers of silicone, a part of solar panels, to be shipped around the world. We know those jobs can be made to happen. At the Boeing Company, we are making airplanes—or shortly will—that can burn biofuels so we don't put out CO₂ emission and pollution. We know those jobs can happen.

Now we want our Republican colleagues to join us in this sense of optimism, because the rule that the EPA has proposed is really pretty modest. Now we're having a full-throated dis-

cussion here, debate, and we'll have a big debate tomorrow about this. But the rule is pretty modest. Let me tell you how modest it is. It simply requires essentially known efficiency standards at very, very large power plants, over 100,000 tons of emissions a year. Now, a lot of small businesses are going to be told, this is going to shut down restaurants and dry cleaners, et cetera. That's bunk. This rule is only proposing to deal with very, very large emitters, like large coal plants. This is a very modest first step in an approach to try to rein in some of these dangerous gases like carbon dioxide and ozone and toxins like that. It is a reasonable first step.

Mr. TONKO. And people have asked, they said, Well, what are these emissions? What are these particulates that may be harmful to us or our children? And when you start talking, Representative INSLEE, about mercury poisoning, when you start talking about carbon emission, when there is the talk about arsenic and lead poisoning, people begin to see it as something very real, something they've heard of, that they know people have been impacted by. So of course people want to protect their children. They are our most sacred commodity. They are a precious commodity. And with so much track record here, 40 years of success, of strong public health standards, it's very difficult to imagine that someone wants to take that backward.

I think of the innovation that I saw when I served as the leader of NYSERDA, the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, which was my last workstation before entering the House. I saw what R&D and basic research, research and development can mean in the new shelf opportunities that come our way that are science and tech associated. You know, people said when you went to the catalytic converter for automobiles, it was going to kill the auto industry, and we're going to have no jobs here. It didn't happen. People understood that this catalytic converter can now clean us of that pollution, that emission.

You know, we were told of all sorts of things that would happen when we were addressing the emissions in some smokestacks. People came about and found ways to make it happen. The industries many times are painted—many out there that are part of this concern—have really come forward and said, This is a reasonable approach. Many have said that. They want predictability. They want some sort of plan, and they'll engage their operation into that plan and its outcome. There are many groups, like Energy, Constellation Energy, NextEra Energy, National Grid, PSE&G, and one in my home base, the New York State Power Authority, all of whom have said that this is a reasonable approach, that they are willing to be those partners out there to make the world, the environment, the air that we breathe a better quality.

So the proof is in the pudding here. There is an outstanding 40-year track record. There are children who breathe freely, and there are lives that have been saved. Just 160,000, if that matters, last year alone. But people need to look at the facts here and not be so connected to those deep pockets, special interests, friends from the oil industry that want to come here and partner with colleagues in the House and say, We're going to undo this, and we're going to kill jobs. Job-killing, life-threatening, health-threatening, toxic poisoning that can take place if we allow it to. And we will stop this, I'm convinced.

Mr. INSLEE. And I hope we will be successful and believe that we will because there are multiple reasons for this. And this really is an issue about democracy, about who is going to make a decision about the air we breathe and the air our children breathe. Is it going to be scientists and physicians at the American Lung Association and scientists who base their decision on science and health? Or is it going to be lobbyists for polluting industries?

Now we say it should be the scientists. We say we should follow the science. When we go to doctors, we get medical advice, it's based on science. When we want health advice, we don't go to lobbyists for polluting industries. We let a health decision be made by scientists. And unfortunately, the dirty air act that my Republican colleagues want to pass, they want to take that decision away from scientists and away from physicians and away from health practitioners and give it to the folks who lobby up here for special breaks. That's wrong.

And I will just make a closing comment, if I can. We are going to fight the dirty air act on behalf of the health of our kids. We are going to fight the dirty air act on behalf of our senior citizens with their health problems. And we are going to fight the dirty air act so that we can grow millions of clean energy jobs right here in this country and not ship them off to China.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I can't help but think too of the Citizens United case, where special interests now are able to open the corporate checkbook and just write sizable checks. The sky is the limit, according to the Supreme Court decision. And that can bring about special interest flavor into campaigns that are waged and into candidates that are produced into the House. And when we look at special interests like that, we then begin to see what the real agenda is, and it's counterproductive. It is kicking back progress that has been achieved for 40 years, celebrations of life that were allowed to breathe freely because of this legislation. And the introduction of innovation and technology.

So these deep-rooted power plays are perhaps going to be more prevalent as we go forward in time, and I think that it's setting a dangerous precedent. I

think that what we have here is an opportunity to say "yes" to sound public health standards, "yes" to job creation, "yes" to innovation. I know that from the work that's being done—even in the auto industry, GE is putting together an advanced battery manufacturing facility that will be available for heavy fleets. We have those who are working on all sorts of alternative fuels. We are looking at renewables to cut the kind of pollution that has been allowed to continue because of our gluttonous dependency on oil imported from unfriendly nations to the U.S. And 60 percent of that demand is met simply by those oil imports. So there is an awful lot of progressive perspective that is associated with what the Clean Air Act has achieved. We have to go forward with this one.

Mr. INSLEE. I would just note in closing that if we are successful in asking Republicans to stand with us against the dirty air act, we will celebrate a Republican achievement of 40 years ago that we will have preserved, the Clean Air Act. And we will argue that the next electric vehicle should be called the Nixon. We want to honor a Republican President. Thanks very much.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative INSLEE.

You know, the efforts made here tonight were to inform people as to the impact that could be felt if we rolled back the progress of the Clean Air Act, one that has had this 40-year record of achievement, one that has given a big boost to innovation in our economy. Our President, this President, President Obama, has indicated that this is the sort of sustainable restructuring of our economy that can drive us forward.

□ 2110

If we invest in the intellect of this great American society, if we encourage education and higher education to be pronounced in the lives of individuals, if we can pull from them their interests in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, we can then have this hopeful opportunity of job creation that comes simply through ideas, ideas that are produced perhaps in that education experience that we can provide for our young people and by public policy that drives initiatives, that drives a series of goals to in this case clean the air quality that has enabled us to go forward with the soundness in the manufacturing sector that has retrofitted, has modernized, has adjusted, retooled that industry, those industries in the manufacturing realm to respond in a way that is much more sensitive to public health standards. This is the sort of progress that we can achieve in this country simply by moving forward with soundness of policy.

And so, I thank all of our colleagues this evening who have joined us in the efforts to speak to the soundness of clean air, what it means not only in public health standards but certainly in the efforts to create jobs and to sus-

tain the economy in a way that will continue to strive to build on the progress that we have achieved over these last four decades, and continue to explore new eras of job creation that will provide the soundness in our economy that will be the strength of this country in many, many decades and generations to come.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TONKO. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I was listening with interest to the gentleman's remarks and especially taking into interest the importance of the Clean Air Act, and I want to commend the gentleman for raising these issues not only with our colleagues, but the importance of why we have to make sure that this part of the element of our current laws are being sustained and upheld.

I think the question also is raised here in terms of this is not a new issue. This is really an issue that has been ongoing for years and years in terms of development versus conservation and the environment. I think the challenge for us as legislators is to see if we can find a sense of balance.

Currently, we have to import well over \$700 billion worth of oil from foreign countries. I don't think our Republican friends think that we're antidevelopment. I think we are for development and in doing it in such a way that the sciences are there and in such a way that it provides safety and, at the same time, provides the kind of resources that are really needful to meet the needs of the American people.

And I want to again commend the gentleman for raising this issue, and I hope that in the coming weeks and months we will continue the dialogue and debate on this very important matter.

Mr. TONKO. Well, Representative FALEOMAVAEGA, thank you for joining us this evening.

But during the course of this hour we have all talked about innovation that we see happening right in our very own districts. I have a global center on renewables that is conducted through the auspices of GE. We talked about their advanced battery manufacturing facility. I talked about the nanoscience that has been promoted in the 21st Congressional District of New York. We witness every day the semiconductor work that is done and work in the biotech and infotech and nanotech communities, all of which are critically important to providing the workforce of the future and the workplace of the future. This is what I think policy like this can initiate.

And I'm certain within the realm of your own district or in the region that you represent or the State that you call home, within that whole context there are those stories of success and innovation. And that, I think, is the outcome here that we want to preserve, and not only preserve but enhance, so that we can continue to grow those

jobs and provide a better quality of life for the people that we represent.

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. I hope that in the coming weeks and months we will continue to discuss this issue and, hopefully, our friends on the other side will understand our concerns.

Again, it's the challenge of establishing a balance between development and the environment and the conservation, and I think the American people are looking for answers to those issues and those problems.

Mr. TONKO. Built on 40 years of success then, we want to defend people of all ages from the most young to the most senior in our society. They have experienced and lived the benefits of soundness of policy that came via the Clean Air Act, a bipartisan effort that was initiated by a Republican President. And so it defies logic to move forward with a plan that will take us backward. So we have to thwart that effort and call it for what it is, check it at the door and say, Look, it is a life-threatening, health-threatening, toxic-poisoning situation that would reduce jobs, denounce innovation in our society, in our economy, and really take us backward.

I think this House ought to be about moving us forward, creating jobs, enhancing the public health standards and embracing the quality of innovation in our society that really builds the magic in our economy, that digs deep into the pioneer spirit that is uniquely American. And we can make it happen simply by saying "no" to those agents that want to roll back progress and defeat us with their dirty air act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back and thank you for the opportunity for all of us to express our concerns about those who are advancing a dirty air act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protect the Clean Air Act. Since the passage of the legislation our skies have become cleaner and our economy has become stronger. Thanks to the Clean Air Act, the United States has made significant gains in public health, a cleaner environment and a stronger more sustainable economy.

Air pollution is costly. It increases asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, respiratory diseases, and lung cancer, and causes premature deaths, hurting our families and burdening our economy. The dangers from air pollution are particularly acute for children and seniors.

It is well established that cleaner air and a healthier population go hand in hand. In fact, according to the American Lung Association, in 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act saved over 160,000 lives.

Cleaner air also helps build a stronger economy. In addition to keeping workers on the job, cleaning up air pollution can create new jobs—in designing and manufacturing pollution controls, installing and operating new equipment, and building cleaner facilities.

The draft bill from Representative UPTON would return us to a Dirty Air Economy, an economy dominated by big polluters willing to pour pollution into our communities in order to help their companies. Erasing the Clean Air

Act may be good for corporate profits but it's bad for our national interest.

The truth is that we can have clean air and a strong economy at the same time. The last 30 years have proved it. Since the passage of the Clean Air Act, the United States has reduced key air pollutants by 60 percent, while growing our economy by over 200 percent. The legislation, in conjunction with additional protections passed by both parties, has made our country a healthier, cleaner place to live.

A new study by scientists at the University of Rochester Medical Center and Clarkson University found that the air quality in Rochester, New York improved markedly in recent years and that public health may well improve as a result. Falling levels of air pollutants given off by cars, trucks and power plants has resulted in far fewer irritants in the air that could worsen asthma and lead to serious respiratory disease. The decline is in part due to the tighter federal rules on diesel fuel and engines that went into effect in 2006 under a Republican Administration. Like others have pointed out before, clean air standards have always been, and should continue to be, a bipartisan concern.

I have the privilege to represent the good people living in Tonawanda, New York—a city that has a staggering and urgent air pollution problem. These hard working Americans are surrounded by facilities that make up the highest concentration of air polluters in the state of New York. In 2007, a study found that the people of Tonawanda's risk of developing cancer are 100 times that of the New York State guideline.

During my time serving the 28th District of New York, I have received multiple letters from the people of Tonawanda telling me about how their family and loved ones have developed cancer, asthma and other illnesses due to the extremely poor air quality in their community.

Today, I would like to share the story of Ann, a woman who has lived in Tonawanda for 16 years. Ann's mother and father moved to the city to fulfill the American dream of owning their own home. Ann's mother cultivated her own garden in her yard, spending her free time outside gardening and breathing in what she thought was fresh, New York air.

Sadly, Ann lost her mother to cancer at the young age of 67, just nine years after moving to Tonawanda and breathing the dirty air. Ann can't help to think that if only her family knew what toxic, cancerous chemicals the local facilities were pumping into the air, they could have protected the health of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of upholding the Clean Air Act and supporting the Environmental Protection Act in doing its work to protect the American people against dangerous corporate polluters. I rise in support of improving our national health and economy, while reducing our dependence on oil. And I rise in support of Ann and the people of Tonawanda who are facing the devastating consequences of air pollution every day.

The choice is simple. When it was passed in 1970, the Clean Air Act was enacted with strong bipartisan support. Like today, we had a divided government, with both parties coming together to enact a law that would protect public health and the environment, as well as our economy.

We must reject any effort to repeal our valuable protections, and recommit our pledge to

the American people to work toward a cleaner, healthier, more prosperous future.

ROLL CALL OF THE PEACE CORPS VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for half the time remaining before 10 p.m., which is roughly 22 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to address an important issue that has come to light recently. It has to do with the wonderful group of volunteers that serve in the United States Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps was the idea of John F. Kennedy. He went to the University of Michigan way back in 1960, and he started encouraging those college students to get involved in other countries and helping those countries in their social development and their cultural development in the name of peace. A wonderful idea.

When he became President in 1961, President Kennedy signed an Executive order establishing the now important Peace Corps. By 1966, there were over 15,000 young Americans, all volunteers, that were working in the Peace Corps throughout the world.

Since those early days of the Peace Corps, 200,000 Americans, mostly young people, 60 percent female, have volunteered for their 2-year service in the Peace Corps to work in Third World countries on everything from health to farming to small business, just helping other people throughout the world in a way that not only benefits them personally but benefits the recipients in these foreign countries. They really are, in my opinion, along with our United States military, the greatest ambassadors we have from our country to show that we are concerned about the welfare of other nations. And they help build a better life for not only the people that they come in contact with, but their generations and the children that they have as well. I think they are really volunteer angels.

The work that a Peace Corps volunteer does is hard work. It's important, but it's very difficult. They're in a place far from home, sometimes very remote and primitive areas, and yet they, on a daily basis, are working to improve the lives of these individuals.

Like I said, I think it's one of the best things that we do in this country as ambassadors are those young people in the Peace Corps. It's tough work. It's hard work. I wouldn't do it. It's so difficult. And you know, there are people in our country, a lot of them mainly young people who choose that as a calling to help other people in other countries.

I've got four kids, and they're all kind of wanting to save the world, too. They've been to Mexico and lived in orphanages in Trinidad. They've been to Honduras. They've been to Africa and