Statement of Chairman Lamar Smith (R-Texas)
Ensuring Sound Science at EPA

Chairman Smith: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has become an agency in pursuit of a purely political agenda rather than an agency that protects the environment. Little that the EPA has proposed would have any significant impact on the environment. But that hasn't stopped the EPA from imposing some of the most expensive and expansive regulations in its history.

These rules will cost billions of dollars, place a heavy burden on American families and diminish the ability of American businesses to compete around the world. EPA’s political agenda is to rearrange the American economy, instituting “command and control” by the Obama administration.

This Committee’s investigations have revealed an EPA that intentionally chooses to ignore good science. EPA cherry-picks the science that fits its agenda and ignores the science that does not support its position. When the science falls short, EPA resorts to a propaganda campaign designed to mislead the public.

Today’s hearing will examine this unprecedented regulatory agenda and the manner in which EPA has used suspect science, questionable legal interpretations, and flawed analysis to justify these regulations.

A glaring example is the president’s so-called Clean Power Plan. This plan is nothing more than a “Power Grab” to give the government more control over Americans’ daily lives.

This regulation stifles economic growth, destroys American jobs, and increases energy prices. That means costs will rise – from electricity to gasoline to food, disproportionately hurting low income Americans.

Even EPA data shows that this regulation would reduce sea level rise by only 1/100th of an inch, the thickness of three sheets of paper. The Clean Power Plan represents massive costs without significant benefits. In other words, it’s all pain and no gain.

The president used this regulation as the cornerstone of his agenda at the Paris Climate talks. The Paris Agreement is a bad deal for the American people that will shrink our economy without any recognized benefit. Even if all 177 countries meet their promised reductions of carbon emissions for the next 85 years, that will reduce temperatures by only 1/6 of 1 degree Celsius. That is incredible!
For almost two years, the Committee requested to see the data EPA uses to justify Clean Air Act regulations. The EPA’s refusal to provide the data led the Science Committee to issue its first subpoena in 21 years to retrieve that information. We are still waiting. What is the Obama administration hiding?

The Committee’s investigation and oversight of the EPA’s development of the Waters of the U.S. rule has revealed troubling and illegal Agency activities.

During the course of our investigation, the Committee found that the EPA engaged in inappropriate tactics to generate grassroots lobbying in support of this rule.

This past December, the Government Accountability Organization (GAO) issued a legal opinion that found that EPA violated both the Anti-Lobbying and Anti-Deficiency Acts.

The EPA’s relationship with activist environmental groups and use of questionable science does not end there. The Committee’s investigation of the agency’s decision to embark on a premature and unprecedented decision to stop the Pebble Mine has shown that career EPA officials acted with blatant bias to determine the outcome.

Also, these same officials intentionally used personal email to prevent the Committee and the EPA Inspector General from discovering the extent of their incriminating actions.

This is just another unfortunate example of the EPA allowing politics rather than science to drive its agenda.

Earlier this Congress, the House approved H.R. 1030, “The Secret Science Reform Act.” This legislation requires the EPA to base its regulations on publically-available data. Why would the EPA want to hide this data from the American people? Either the data is science fiction or doesn’t exist?

During the last year, several of EPA’s major regulations have been halted by Federal Courts. These include the agency’s efforts to stop the Pebble Mine, the controversial Waters of the U.S. rule, and the Clean Power Plan. Many of these regulations trample on the constitutional rights of individuals and rely on suspect legal interpretations of the law.

I hope the Administrator will tell us today how she intends to follow the law in writing regulations and when she will provide the American people with the data and other information that this committee has requested.
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