

Chairman Hal Rogers
House Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment
Department of State FY 2013 Budget Request
February 29, 2012

Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding. Administrator Jackson, thank you for being here today.

As I have already told Secretaries Salazar and Chu during their respective testimonies before the Appropriations Committee, I have deep concerns about the impact of the President's budget on our energy and economic security. Despite our Nation being the Saudi Arabia of coal and enjoying the rapid expansion of recoverable natural gas and oil resources, the Department of Energy is cutting investment in conventional energy technology. Meanwhile, in spite of the rising cost of gas to near \$5 a gallon, the Department of Interior is limiting offshore drilling while pursuing administrative mergers that threaten mining across the country.

For its part, over the last three years the EPA has unveiled a litany of questionable regulations and legally dubious guidance that threaten our energy security and our troubled economy. Your Agency has locked up coal mining permits, stood in the way of domestic energy development, and sought to block the expansion of hydraulic fracturing. The Utility MACT rule, which by EPA's own forecast will be the most expensive in history, threatens to shutter power stations and eliminate tens of thousands of jobs at a time when we're already facing rising energy costs and high unemployment.

The logical conclusion? This is a coordinated, methodical White House assault on carbon energy from extraction, to generation, to the eventual delivery of power to consumers, factories, and working families.

While the Administration has suggested an "all-of-the-above" approach in the press, the actions of DOE, Interior, EPA and others suggest a "select-few-of-the-above" approach. Meanwhile, the House of Representatives has been loud and clear – roll back regulations; expand access to our vast conventional energy resources; invest in American energy jobs; and cease playing political favorites with our energy security.

If EPA regulatory actions aren't enough proof of this orchestrated anti-carbon effort, EPA's \$8.2 billion budget request for FY13 certainly is. Despite a decrease of 1.2% from 2012, this request remains the agency's fifth largest, prioritizing regulation over job creation.

You have requested the largest regulatory enforcement budget in history at \$400 million and explicitly declared your intentions to regulate greenhouse gases. While state grants get hacked by 7%, sector-specific grants for Administration pet projects are up 14%, and funding for climate change research is up 19% -- reflecting a centralization of funding for the Administration's favored projects. Your agency has **also** received significant criticism for justifying new regulations using assumptions and models that are not open to public scrutiny. With that in mind, I wish to know why your Agency should receive greater funding for conducting these nontransparent studies to support the implementation of rules that have been arbitrarily enforced, **would be harmful to job creation**, and **that are** tremendously unpopular with just about everyone.

The 112th Congress has been solely focused on reining in out-of-control spending, getting our economy back on track and putting Americans back to work. This Committee in particular is charged with the constitutional responsibility to ensure that federal funds are spent wisely and effectively and in a way that actually benefits taxpayers and our national security. As you can surmise, I have trouble believing that this year's budget request truly meets these standards. I look forward to an explanation of your budget request. Thank you.

#####