

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 115th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Vice Chairman LEAHY, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

## COMMITTEE RULES—115TH CONGRESS

## I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

## II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

## III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

## IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of staff members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee staff who have a responsibility associated with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

## V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the full Committee for its decision.

## VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee's consideration of said bill and report.

## VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by Senators at full Committee markups shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

## VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill is hereby

authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

## IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

## CONFIRMATION OF SCOTT PRUITT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I had very serious concerns about the nomination of Attorney General Scott Pruitt for Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, and opposed his nomination. His record on the environment is abysmal. My office received a great number of comments from people in the State of Vermont, which takes environmental protection very seriously, as well as from all over the country. They fear that Mr. Pruitt is bought and paid for by the fossil fuel industry and the protection of our environment is in serious jeopardy. Make no mistake, the nomination of Scott Pruitt was a nomination designed to protect the fossil fuel industry and not the environment.

In many ways, Scott Pruitt is the worst of the worst of all of Trump's nominees. Donald Trump was going to drain the swamp. He promised to "break the cycle of corruption" and "give new voices a chance to go into government service." Well, guess who is running the swamp now: the same corporate cronies Trump promised to drain out of Washington.

Scott Pruitt wants to be the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, but he is no friend of the environment. He boasts on his website that he is a "leading advocate" against the EPA. He said, "The agency's actions are at best incompetent, and at worst reprehensible." He testified to the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in May 2016 that "the EPA was never intended to be our Nation's frontline environmental regulator."

What is particularly troubling is his record as Oklahoma's attorney general—as Oklahoma's chief enforcer of clean air and water protections for his constituents—he sued the EPA 14 times and still has 8 active cases against the EPA. In all but one of these 14 cases Pruitt brought against the EPA, he was on the side of corporate interests. And in 13 of the 14, these companies or trade associations were also financial contributors to Mr. Pruitt's political causes.

Shockingly, Scott Pruitt disbanded the Environmental Protection Unit of the Oklahoma Attorney General's Office. He claims that he continued environmental protection, but the State budget shows that funding for "environmental law" in the attorney general's office fell from \$486,000 in 2011 to 0 in 2014. In the State's 2016 budget, there was a line item for "environ-

mental law"—with \$0. In fact, of the more than 700 press releases he issued as Oklahoma's top law enforcement official, not one touts an environmental enforcement case in Oklahoma. It seems clear that he abandoned all meaningful environmental protection. This is concerning because reports show that the Trump administration is considering eliminating the EPA's Office of Enforcement, which would mean that the Agency would no longer be able to independently enforce our Nation's antipollution laws.

At a time when we have to strengthen environmental protection, Mr. Pruitt will be working overtime to carry out President Trump's goal to destroy the EPA. Does this sound like someone who should be running the EPA? Not to me. More than 230 different environmental, health, and public interest groups agree that Pruitt is unqualified—so do former EPA employees. More than 770 of them from across the country all signed on to a letter that asked us to reject Pruitt as the next EPA Administrator. When hundreds of environmental groups and former EPA employees tell us that this guy is not qualified, maybe we should listen.

The scariest thing about Scott Pruitt being the Administrator of the EPA is that our EPA should be working nonstop to address the most pressing environmental issue of our time—the global crisis of climate change. In 2009, the EPA Administrator found that the carbon pollution causing climate change threatens the public health and welfare of current and future generations; yet President Trump has called climate change a "hoax." In November 2012, he tweeted: "The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive."

Perhaps it should come as no surprise that Mr. Pruitt takes the same page from President Trump. Pruitt said in March 2016, "Reasonable minds can disagree about the science behind global warming, and disagree they do." He also said "The debate about climate change is just that, a debate. There are scientists that agree, there are scientists that don't agree, to the extent of man's contribution and whether it is even harmful at this point," he added "We've had ebb and flow, we've had obviously climate conditions change throughout our history and that is scientific fact. It gets cooler. It gets hotter. And we do not know the trajectory is on an unsustainable course. Nor do we know, the extent by which the burning of fossil fuels, and man's contribution to that, is making it far worse than it is."

When I questioned Mr. Pruitt in his confirmation hearing on January 18, he said: "I believe . . . the degree of human activity's impact on the climate is subject to more debate on whether the climate is changing or whether human activity contributes to it." He even told me that he thinks that his opinion on climate change is