HEARING ON: ''ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF EPA GREENHOUSE GAS REGULATIONS ON SMALL BUSINESS''

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit my opening statement given at the hearing.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this important hearing. Today, we are here to discuss the impact of greenhouse gas regulations on small businesses. America's small businesses are the lifeblood of this country's economy. Competition, innovation and the entrepreneurial spirit have driven America's prosperity, and it is our job in Congress to ensure that we facilitate and promote an environment of economic opportunity. It is also our job to protect the well being of America's citizens, with the bottom line of providing the highest quality of life possible for each and every person.

Based on actual results, and future projections, it is clear that the Clean Air Act strikes a balance between economic growth and keeping each and every one of us healthy. By 2020, for every taxpayer dollar invested in the Clean Air Act, there will be an estimated 30 dollar return in benefits. In the year 2010 alone, the Clean Air Act prevented over 160,000 deaths, over three million lost school days and 13 million days of lost work. These numbers are illustrative of the benefits to both businesses and public health facilitated by the Clean Air Act.

The regulation of greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act is imperative to protecting public health and welfare. The threat posed by climate change is based on peer-reviewed, accurate, and concrete science—the threat is real, and preventative steps are necessary. The EPA's regulation of greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act is a measured, commonsense approach to mitigating climate change that protects not only public health and welfare, but business as well.

Opponents of greenhouse gas regulation claim that small entities will be overly burdened by costly and unattainable emissions standards. However, the EPA's implementation of the ''Tailoring Rule'' is a small business-conscious method of protecting public health, and this country's employers and employees. The tailoring rule, by setting a high greenhouse gas emission threshold, exempts 95 percent of all stationary sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Essentially, the tailoring rule lifts a regulatory burden off of small businesses.

In written testimony provided for today's hearing, the Small Business Majority, a representative of US small businesses, states that:

''Some will claim that a variety of small businesses—everything from bookstores to diners and plumbers—would be impacted by the greenhouse gas standards. This simply isn't the case.''

Further, as described in the Small Business Majority's testimony, a significant number of small business owners welcome measures to reduce environmental pollution; this sentiment cannot simply be ignored.

As I have said at this subcommittee's past two meetings, we cannot have a productive discussion about the impacts of regulations without considering both costs and benefits. For example, when we talk about the new tailpipe emissions standards we cannot simply discuss a potential increase in the sticker price of a vehicle.

The proposed standards for heavy and medium duty trucks—despite a marginal increase in sticker price—are projected to save over $74,000 over the life of the truck, and save over 500 million barrels of oil. Multiply that times all the trucks on the road, and the reduced fuel consumption and reduced greenhouse gas pollutant emissions can help us achieve energy independence while improving our public health.

I look forward to having a well rounded discussion about greenhouse gas emission standards, their costs and their benefits, with today's witnesses.

ENERGY TAX PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 910) to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chair, the bill before us today is bad for America's health and reduces progress in our nation's energy independence. I oppose this 'dirty air act' that would eliminate the ability of the EPA to address the very serious public health threats from carbon pollution.

The Clean Air Act requires that if the EPA finds carbon pollution to be detrimental to our health, then the EPA must regulate greenhouse gas emissions. Despite the U.S. Supreme Court upholding this authority, today's legislation would exempt our nation's largest polluters from regulation, eliminate public health protections, and push back efforts to reduce our dependence on foreign energy resources. By preventing the EPA from setting carbon pollution national automobile standards, this bill does nothing to reduce consumption and reliance on foreign oil.

The EPA helps protect our nation's most vulnerable—including children, seniors and those suffering from respiratory ailments—by guaranteeing the air we breathe is safe and healthy. Dirty air has been linked to an increase in asthma rates, especially among young people, an increase in emergency room visits and hospitalizations, and an increase in heart attacks and strokes. In New York, pediatric asthma affects an estimated half million children and an additional estimated 1.5 million adults 18 and over have asthma, based on 2009 rates.

All across the country, Americans overwhelmingly support EPA protections for the air we breathe and the water we drink. Supporting this bill disregards science, ignores public health concerns, and does nothing to curb carbon emissions. I urge a no vote.

ENERGY TAX PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 910) to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, over forty years after the passage of the Clean Air Act, there are apparently still Members of this House who think you can't have jobs unless you have a polluted environment. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Over the past 40 years, the Clean Air Act has reduced smog-producing sulfur dioxide and particulate pollution by 60% while our economy has nearly tripled. Since the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, electricity production has increased and prices have remained stable. A rigorous, peer-reviewed analysis of the Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act from 1990–2020 conducted by the EPA found that air quality improvements under the Clean Air Act will save $2 trillion and prevent at least 230,000 deaths annually.

The record is clear: a healthy environment and a strong economy are not mutually exclusive. They go hand in hand. Which is why this attempt to gut the Clean Air Act by preventing EPA from regulating carbon pollution is so misplaced. Given our 40-year history with the Clean Air Act, the last thing Americans want is a bunch of politicians substituting their own ideological agenda for sound science and telling EPA it can't do its job.

I urge a no vote.

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 7, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to acknowledge the hard work and determination that Habitat for Humanity has provided for a deserving family in my district. Habitat for Humanity of Prince William County, Manassas, and Manassas Park purchased a three-bedroom townhouse in Manassas using funds from the Neighborhood Stabilization Program administered by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development. The organizations began extensive renovations on the townhouse on October 9, 2010.

The deserving recipient is a single mother who offers support and care for her disabled mother, along with working full-time and caring for her son. With the high cost of living in northern Virginia, the mother believed that she would never be able to purchase a home. She learned about the Habitat for Humanity home ownership program and applied in November 2009. After 1,100 hours of volunteer labor by nearly 100 volunteers, the house was dedicated on April 2 to the woman and her family.