

that the opposition could support. In fact, surely, that is something that the White House would support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yea” vote on this matter, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CHRIS STEWART, former Chairman of the Science Committee’s Environment Subcommittee, for his hard work on this important piece of legislation. H.R. 1422, The Science Advisory Board Reform Act, ensures balanced and transparent review of regulatory science.

Specifically, it strengthens the Board’s independence so that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) cannot further its regulatory ambitions under the guise of science.

Costly regulations often lead to a loss of jobs and higher electricity bills and gasoline prices for Americans.

The EPA has an extensive track record of twisting the science to justify their actions. Behind the scenes, however, there is a review process that was intended to provide a critical check on the Agency’s conclusions.

The EPA’s Science Advisory Board (SAB) was intended to provide a meaningful, balanced, and independent assessment of the science that supports the Agency’s regulations. Unfortunately, this vision is not being realized.

The EPA undermines the Board’s independence and prevents it from providing advice to Congress. As a result, the valuable advice these experts can provide is wasted.

At a time when the Agency is pursuing the most aggressive regulatory agenda in its 44 year history, it is critical that the Board function as intended.

Despite the existing requirement that EPA’s advisory panels be “fairly balanced in terms of point of view represented,” the Science Committee has identified a number of problems that undermine the panel’s credibility and work product. These include:

A majority of the members of EPA’s key advisory panels have received money from the EPA. Often the research they are reviewing is directly related to the money they received. This creates at least the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Many of the panelists have taken very public and even political positions on issues they are advising about. For example, a lead reviewer of EPA’s hydraulic fracturing study plan published an anti-fracking article entitled “Regulate, Baby, Regulate.” This is clearly not an objective viewpoint.

Public participation is limited during most Board meetings; interested parties have almost no ability to comment on the scope of the work—and meeting records are often kept secret.

The EPA routinely excludes private sector experts while stacking the review panels with individuals who will give the EPA the answer it wants.

H.R. 1422 expands transparency requirements, improves the process for selecting expert advisors, and strengthens public participation requirements.

The bill requires that uncertainties in the Agency’s scientific conclusions be communicated and limits the SAB from providing partisan policy advice.

This legislation is pro-science. It restores the SAB as an important defender of scientific

integrity. These common sense reforms will make EPA’s decisions more credible and balanced.

I thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Stewart for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1422 is postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1701

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 o’clock and 1 minute p.m.

#### EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1422) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, all time for debate on the bill, as amended, had expired.

AMENDMENT PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT 113-626 OFFERED BY MR. STEWART

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 7, through page 9, line 1, redesignate subsections (a) through (e) as subsections (b) through (f), respectively.

Page 3, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

(a) INDEPENDENT ADVICE.—Section 8(a) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365(a)) is amended by inserting “independently” after “Advisory Board which shall”.

Page 3, line 14, strike “in consultation with the Administrator”.

Page 3, lines 18 through 20, strike “select Board” and all that follows through “and shall”.

Page 4, line 18, strike “and” and insert “or”.

Page 5, line 3, insert “the Interior,” after “Energy,”.

Page 5, line 5, strike “them” and insert “each”.

Page 6, line 17, insert “or draft” before “risk”.

Page 6, line 18, strike “and”.

Page 6, line 19, redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C).

Page 6, after line 18, insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) by striking “formal”; and

Page 6, line 19, insert “or draft” before “risk”.

Page 6, line 22, insert “or draft” before “risk”.

Page 7, line 10, insert “(1)(A)” after “(e)” both places it appears.

Page 7, lines 13, 17, and 19, redesignate paragraphs (1) through (3) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and conform the margins accordingly.

Page 7, lines 22 and 23, strike “by adding after subsection (g) the following” and inserting “by amending subsection (h) to read as follows”.

Page 9, lines 2 and 3, strike “by adding after subsection (h), as added by subsection (d) of this section, the following” and inserting “by amending subsection (i) to read as follows”.

Page 9, line 11, insert “or Congress” after “the Administrator”.

Page 9, line 15, strike “and the Administrator” and insert “, the Administrator, and Congress”.

Page 9, line 19, after paragraph (4) insert the following new paragraph:

“(5) The Board shall be fully and timely responsive to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this amendment makes a number of technical and conforming changes to address revisions to the existing statute that occurred with the passage of the farm bill. I am pleased to have worked with Representative DAVIS to strengthen the changes to the statute that he was able to secure in passage of the farm bill.

This amendment is critical to ensure that the underlying bill can be properly applied to existing statute. Just this morning, the legislation received the support of the American Farm Bureau, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I ask for your support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

I want to state again that I have appreciated Mr. STEWART’s collaboration on bills that have come through the Science Committee in the past, and I definitely appreciate his intent to strengthen and bring more transparency to the Science Advisory Board. However, as explained previously and as I will explain, this bill and this amendment do not accomplish what needs to be done.

Although my friend’s amendment seems to make mostly minor and technical corrections, there are a few