AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

COMMITTEE FUNDING FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS (DAY 2)

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Held in Washington, DC, March 6, 2013

Printed for the use of the Committee on House Administration

Available on the Internet
www.fdsys.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

80–286 WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, *Chairman*

GREGG HARPER, Mississippi
PHIL GINGREY, M.D., Georgia
AARON SCHOCK, Illinois
TODD ROKITA, Indiana
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida

ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
Ranking Minority Member
ZOE LOFGREN, California
JUAN VARGAS, California

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

KELLY CRAVEN, *Staff Director*
JAMIE FLEET, *Minority Staff Director*

COMMITTEE FUNDING FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS (DAY 2)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2013

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:44 a.m., in Room 1310, Longworth, Hon. Candice S. Miller [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives, Miller, Harper, Nugent, Brady and Lofgren.

Staff Present: Kelly Craven, Staff Director; Phil Kiko, General Counsel; Peter Schalestock, Deputy General Counsel; Kimani Little, Parliamentarian; Joe Wallace, Legislative Clerk; Yael Barash, Assistant Legislative Clerk; Salley Wood, Communications Director/Deputy Staff Director; Bob Sensenbrenner, Elections Counsel; George Hadjiski, Director of Member Services; Richard Cappetto, Professional Staff; Jamie Fleet, Minority Staff Director; Thomas Hicks, Minority Elections Counsel; Greg Abbott, Minority Professional Staff; and Eddie Flaherty, Minority Professional Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now convene the Committee on House Administration to continue the hearing on committee funding for the 113th Congress. A quorum is present, so we may proceed.

And the committee now welcomes Chairman Smith and Ranking Member Johnson from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. The official reporter will please enter a page break. We have a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. Tracing back to the late 1950s and the space race, this Committee on Science, Space, Technology has had a very important history. Its jurisdiction extends over all energy research and development, all Federally-owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratories, astronautical research and development, civil aviation research and development, environmental research and development, the commercial application of energy technology, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation, and the National Weather Service.

Among its priorities for the 113th are to oversee the Department of Energy's Office of Science, its Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, and the DOE's loan guarantee programs, its contract management systems, NASA's continuing mission and efforts, and our Nation's nuclear research and development.

So, this morning, the committee is proud to have before it Chairman Smith and Ranking Member Johnson. And we appreciate you

both coming. The committee has had an opportunity to already evaluate the materials that you have sent us, and we are looking at them very seriously, and we certainly appreciate both of you being in attendance today.

And the chair recognizes Chairman Smith for his testimony.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. LAMAR SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Miller, Ranking Member Brady, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the Science, Space, and Technology's budget for the 113th Congress.

In this economy, all Americans are forced to tighten their belts and do more with less. This is something that the Science Committee has been doing for many years. The committee's budget has been cut much more than the typical House committee over the last 2 years. Since 2010, our budget has been reduced by 16.4 percent, other committees have averaged 11.8 percent. And there is a chart attached to my opening statement if you want to take a look at that. All we ask for today—that is it. And that is the chart that shows other committees have averaged 16 percent—I mean, we have been cut 16 percent, and other committees have averaged 11 percent.

All we ask for today is fairness. Our request for 2013 sets the Science Committee's funding at a level that would treat it like other House committees. Even at this level, the committee would operate in 2013 with a smaller budget than it did in 2005. As the chart shows, the Science Committee's budget was cut 16.4 percent over the last 2 years. On average, other committees were cut 11.8 percent. So the Science Committee was cut 4.6 percent more than the average of other committees.

I am a fiscal conservative, but I also believe in fairness. And I know members of this committee share that sentiment. The Science Committee's jurisdiction is broad and diverse, covering Federal research and development activities in many different agencies. We oversee all or a part of NASA, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Energy, National Science Foundation, FAA, and FEMA. America's economy is driven by innovation and technological advancements, and the purpose of the Science Committee is to encourage the R&D that leads to new innovations and job creation. This is America's future.

To perform effective and efficient oversight and develop legislative policy direction, we must ensure that staffs on both sides of the aisle are equipped with the technical expertise necessary to handle this diverse jurisdiction. We are also endeavoring to revitalize the Science Committee and have taken several steps to increase the pace of our activities. We split the Energy and Environment Subcommittee into two separate subcommittees because each subject deserves more attention. So we now have six subcommittees instead of five. The staff is working hard. But to be more effective, we will need to be treated like other committees. The Science Committee also will review major programs that require legislative authorization. It has been 3 years since the committee reauthorized

NASA, the National Science Foundation, STEM education, and energy research and development programs, and we aim to reauthorize all of those this year. We also will be reauthorizing a cybersecurity research and development program for the first time in 11 years. I expect that there will be at least twice as many hearings in this Congress as in the last Congress. So we will be more than busy. The Science Committee ensures that taxpayers and the American people receive a strong return on their investments.

Again, as matter of fairness, our request before you for $6.3 million sets the Science Committee's funding at a level for it to be treated like other House committees. Thank you for your time. And I look forward to your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Smith of Texas follows:]

Statement of Science Committee Chairman Lamar Smith
Committee on House Administration
Science Committee Budget for the 113th Congress
11:30 am on Wednesday, March 6, 2013
FINAL

Chairwoman Miller, Ranking Member Brady and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's budget for the 113th Congress.

In this economy all Americans are forced to tighten their belts and do more with less. This is something that the Science Committee has done for many years.

The committee's budget has been cut much more than the typical House Committee over the last two years. Since 2010, our budget has been reduced by 16.4%. Please see the chart, which I hope is on your desk.

All we ask for today is fairness. Our request for 2013 sets the Science Committee's funding at a level that would treat it like other House Committees. Even at this level, the Committee would operate in 2013 with a smaller budget than it did in 2005.

This is simple fairness. As the chart shows, the Science Committee's budget was cut 16.4 percent over the last two years. On average, other Committees were cut only 11.8 percent. So the Science Committee was cut 4.6 percent more than other committees.

I am a fiscal conservative, but I also believe in fairness. And I know members of this committee share that commitment.

The Science Committee's jurisdiction is broad and diverse, covering federal research and development activities in many different agencies.

America's economy is driven by innovation and technological advancements. And the purpose of the Science Committee is to encourage the R&D that leads to new innovations and job creation. This is America's future.

To perform effective and efficient oversight and develop legislative policy direction, we must ensure that staffs on both sides of the aisle are equipped with the technical expertise necessary to handle this diverse jurisdiction.

We are also endeavoring to revitalize the Science Committee and have taken several steps to increase the pace of our activities. We split the Energy and Environment Subcommittee into two separate Subcommittees because each subject deserves more attention. So we now have six subcommittees. The staff is working hard, but to be more effective, we will need to be treated like other committees.

The Science Committee also will review major programs that require legislative authorization. It has been three years since the Committee reauthorized NASA, the National Science Foundation, STEM education, and Energy R&D programs. We will also be reauthorizing a cybersecurity R&D program for the first time in eleven years.

The Science Committee ensures that taxpayers and the American people receive a strong return on their investments. Again, as a matter of fairness, our request before you for $6.3 million sets the Science Committee's funding at a level for it to be treated like other House Committees.

Thank you for your time and I welcome any questions you may have.

###

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Chairman.

And the chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Texas, Ranking Member Johnson.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I just got this email, which I will read before my remarks: "The greatest difference in our generation may not be between liberals and conservatives, but between the pioneers of the future and prisoners of the past. Let me explain. Across America and around the world, there are countless pioneers inventing the future, and many of their developments will change our lives."

That is really the mission of our committee. That is from Newt Gingrich.

Good morning, and let me thank you for the opportunity to speak today. That just came in, and it intrigued me. Chairman Smith has already presented an overview of our committee's finances, so I will just make a few remarks. As the chairman has already noted, we have absorbed a disproportionate cut relative to other committees in the 112th Congress.

The result of that 16.4 percent reduction in our budget since 2010 was to force us to defer filling several staff slots, as well as to cut salaries of most of the staff who were retained from the 111th Congress. We also had to significantly limit committee oversight travel by members and staff.

So, as we start the 113th Congress, Chairman Smith and I are committed to having the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology be active on the many important oversight and legislative matters within our jurisdiction. That jurisdiction is very broad and complex, ranging from areas as different as nanotechnology, space exploration, manufacturing technology, energy innovation, and STEM education, just to name a few.

Attracting and retaining staff with the required experience and skills, as well as providing opportunities for members to visit the laboratories and other R&D organizations and talk to their personnel requires resources. And the level of cuts we have already absorbed has complicated these efforts. I would argue that the sequestration cuts that have now gone into effect will have impacts on our agencies that will only increase our oversight responsibilities, not diminish them.

In addition, our committee will be undertaking a number of major legislative reauthorizations in the 113th Congress, including COMPETES and NASA, as well as a number of energy R&D programs.

In closing, the Committee of Science, Space, and Technology will have an important role in determining policies that will impact the future of both our economy and our quality of life. While I think resources beyond those contained in the chairman's request are warranted to enable us to do our jobs effectively, I would request that, at a minimum, the committee grant us the funding level requested in the chairman's testimony.

I thank you for your time, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

[The statement of Ms. Johnson follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

TO

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

March 6, 2013

Good morning, Chairwoman Miller, Ranking Member Bradley, and Members of the Committee. I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak today about our Committee funding for the 113th Congress. Chairman Smith has already presented an overview of the Committee's finances, so I will just make brief remarks.

As the Chairman has already noted, we had to absorb a disproportionate cut relative to other Committees in the 112th Congress. The result of that 16.4% reduction in our budget since 2010 was to force us to defer filling several staff slots as well as to cut the salaries of most of the staff who were retained from the 111th Congress. We also had to significantly limit Committee oversight travel by Members and staff.

As we start the 113th Congress, Chairman Smith and I are committed to having the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology be active on the many important oversight and legislative matters within our jurisdiction. That jurisdiction is very broad and complex, ranging from areas as different as nanotechnology, space exploration, manufacturing technology, energy innovation, and STEM education, to name just a few. Attracting and retaining staff with the required experience and skills, as well as providing opportunities for Members to visit the laboratories and other R&D organizations and talk to their personnel requires resources, and the level of cuts we have already absorbed has complicated those efforts.

I would argue that the sequestration cuts that have now gone into effect will have impacts on our agencies that will only increase our oversight responsibilities, not diminish them. In addition, our Committee will be undertaking a number of major legislative reauthorizations in the 113th Congress, including COMPETES and NASA, as well as a number of energy R&D programs.

In closing, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will have an important role in determining policies that will impact the future of both our economy and our quality of life. While I think resources beyond those contained in the Chairman's request are warranted to enable us to do our jobs effectively, I would request that at a minimum the Committee grant us the funding level requested in the Chairman's testimony.

Thank you for your time, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you both very much for your testimony. And you do have an incredible amount of challenges before you as you go into the 113th, as Chairman Smith has laid out. I tried to take some notes on all these various things you are going to be reauthorizing here. And that is a very high level of activity.

And I was also looking at some of the field hearings that you are looking at going to. And certainly going to Marshall's—or Marshall Space Flight Center, Kennedy Space Center, et cetera, are all things that are important, particularly with what is happening with the transition in NASA with the space program going to Orion and some of various kinds of things that are happening there I think are important for the committee as well.

One thing I would—I don't know if I am asking particularly a question, or perhaps just making you an offer here, our committee is really wanting to try to assist all the various committees as you utilize new technology for various kinds of things so you don't have duplicative kinds of activities happening, and for instance, some of the enterprise solutions that this committee has been very proactive on. And we really want to ratchet that up as we go forward here, being able to resource the various committees in ways that we might be able to, like using the cloud computing.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Even some of the—I was trying to look through some of the information that you provided us about, you know, whether it is Web development or various things like that. I guess I would just say that our staff wants to assist in any way that you think is appropriate for us to do so to help you. You know, subscription services, I know it sounds small, but I mean the ability to save $5,000, $10,000, et cetera, et cetera, helps you a bit with some of your staffing. And all of that can add up I think a bit. But certainly, with the IT might be another area to look at as well.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Chair, I actually have a couple of suggestions in that area you might expect from the Science and Technology Committee.

One is a House-wide software licenses for Adobe Professional would be very useful and likely to save the taxpayer considerable funds when looking at the costs relative to the numerous purchases of software by other committees. And then a license for the Citrix Solution the committee has already implemented could potentially provide benefits we see in the solution to the entire House. So those are two areas where I think other committees and the House itself would save.

On the Citrix, let me go into a little bit more detail there. The Citrix system is what allows remote access by staff, particularly maybe on occasions like today when they need to ensure continuity of operations and they can't be in their offices, or when we have a disaster recovery, something like that. So that system could help, as well as the Adobe Professional. So those would be two areas that I think would reap savings across the board.

The CHAIRMAN. I see my staff back here busily taking notes while you are mentioning those. So we appreciate that input.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. We hope that you would credit the committee's budget with any savings that accrue.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take that under advisement.

We are really trying to think about how we can improve the Wi-Fi service on the Hill. I mean, as you go to a lot of paperless kinds of hearings and all that, so people can use their iPads instead. There are just a lot of things that we have always done it this way, but time to step it up here a bit, right? So I just mention that as well.

At this time, I would recognize our Ranking Member Brady for his questions.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

My only question would be in this time of difficulty with the cuts that we have and you had, and the cuts that you may be expecting, do either one of you or both of you have problems finding quality people and probably most important, keeping the quality people with the institutional knowledge that you have coming in with their services? They can make more money on the outside, and now, they are being asked to take another cut.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Right. Congressman Brady, I couldn't have asked for a better question about trying to find quality people, because we have been somewhat hampered in our ability to attract, for instance, subcommittee staff directors to join us because we haven't been able to necessarily equal the salaries that they are being paid in the private sector. So that is one of the reasons why I hope that we are granted some deference on the budget so that we can make offers to individuals, and so that they will be able to consider working on the Hill and working for our committee.

We have a number of openings, and unfortunately, we are making offers to individuals and asking them to take a pay cut. And that is not conducive to attracting the best individuals, necessarily. So it all comes back to the budget, and if we have enough to pay what is comparable in the private sector, we should be able to attract those individuals. But that is a serious concern.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you. And thank you for your testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your talking about reauthorizing NASA. And really, it is I think an unfortunate thing that our space program is not moving forward as I think many would like it to be. And I certainly see the private sector getting much more involved. And that is fine. But when you see China and Russia and others taking off like this, reauthorizing NASA is very important. I just have to tell you one personal reason I have always been sort of a space nut, because my dad actually was an aeronautical engineer. He has passed on now. But he worked with Wernher Von Braun at Redstone. And when we were kids, you know, I mean, here he was sort of a rocket scientist, and he used to come home very upset sometimes because he would say, now the government is getting involved in the space program, and we no longer can set off a rocket until the weight of the paperwork equals the weight of the rocket, you know. We used to be able just do what we wanted, but now the government is involved and is stopping our creativity.

But really there has been such a tremendous amount of spin off. We are talking about technology, and whether it is your GPS, just getting to work this morning or whatever, these are all spin-offs of the space program, incredible amounts of stride that the taxpayers get in an indirect way from the space program. So I think it is very important your committee is reauthorizing NASA.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Chair, if we reauthorize that, that will be the first time in 3 years. It is a $17 billion reauthorization. And I hope this year will be a bipartisan effort as well. Congresswoman Lofgren sits on the committee, too. And I am certainly pleased to hear you are sympathetic to aeronautical engineers. We will put more of those in our budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good.

The chair would recognize the gentlelady from California if she would like to question.

Ms. LOFGREN. No, Madam Chair. I understand that the majority and minority are working closely together to deal with this as best we can. And I certainly will do my part, not only as a member of this committee, but as a member of the Science Committee. And I want to praise both the chair and ranking member for their leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you both for coming. Is there anything else you want to tell the committee? Anything at all? Otherwise, we certainly appreciate your attendance this morning. We certainly will take into consideration and look at the graph that you have given us and recognize what has happened to the committee in the last several years and what you are looking at going forward. We appreciate you both coming.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

The committee is going to recess until 10:30.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. We will now reconvene the Committee on House Admin to continue the hearing on committee funding for the 113th. A quorum is present, so we may now proceed. The committee now welcomes Chairman Goodlatte and Ranking Member Conyers of the great State of Michigan for the Committee on the Judiciary. And the official reporter will enter a page break. We have a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The House Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over protecting our constitutional freedoms and civil liberties, oversight of the United States Departments of Justice and Homeland Security, legal, regulatory innovation, competition, and antitrust laws, terrorism and crime, and immigration reform. The committee also has jurisdiction over all proposed amendments to the Constitution.

Its priorities during the 113th include small business regulatory relief, immigration reform, enhancing efficiencies within our legal system, discouraging frivolous lawsuits, modernizing our patent and copyright laws, and ensuring our cybersecurity efforts match our national security needs. We appreciate both the chairman and the ranking member, their attendance here today before our committee. The committee has had an opportunity to evaluate all of your submitted requests, and we are looking at all of that, and are going to give it every serious consideration certainly. And we again appreciate your attendance.

And the chair now recognizes Chairman Goodlatte for his remarks.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. BOB GOODLATTE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. GOODLATTE. Thank you, Madam Chairman and Ranking Member Brady, and members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the Judiciary Committee's budget for the first session of the 113th Congress. In this economy, all Americans are forced to tighten their belts and do more with less. I recognize that. And the Judiciary Committee is prepared to do the same.

However, Ranking Member Conyers and I would like to make the case before you today that the Judiciary Committee is deserving of the maximum amount of funds that you can dedicate to it. Historically, the Judiciary Committee is one of the most active committees in the Congress. In the 112th Congress, for example, nearly 15 percent of the total legislative measures introduced were referred to the committee. The Judiciary Committee reported 77 bills and resolutions to the House, with accompanying legislative reports on all but a few.

In addition, a total of 42 bills in which the Judiciary Committee had a jurisdictional interest were signed into law by the President. Excluding postal designations and coin-naming bills, the Judiciary Committee had more legislation under its primary jurisdiction enacted into law than any other House committee.

Already in the 113th Congress, the Judiciary Committee has been hard at work to meet the demands of the heavy workload of the committee, including work on issues of great importance to the entire Congress. One only needs to pick up a newspaper and read the headlines to appreciate how busy the Judiciary Committee has been and will continue to be this year as we consider such issues as immigration reform and firearms, in addition to our normal heavy workload.

We also expect to increase the committee's efforts to engage in aggressive oversight this Congress. Among the important issues the committee continues to consider are ensuring that Federal law enforcement agencies have the necessary tools to prevent terrorist attacks, that the constitutional rights and civil liberties of Americans are protected, that America's borders are secure, and that the administration of justice is fair and efficient within both the Justice Department and Federal law enforcement agencies, and within our Federal judiciary.

In addition, the committee plays an important role in strengthening our economy and putting Americans back to work. We ensure robust and fair competition under the antitrust laws, encourage innovation, and promote America's global competitiveness through our intellectual property laws, improve our immigration laws to attract the best and brightest from around the world, and bolster the business climate by providing relief from burdensome and excessive regulations.

These issues are critical to the safety and economic well being of millions of Americans. Because of this, it is vital that we retain a highly qualified staff as the cornerstone of the committee's capacity to consider complicated and often controversial legislation and policy issues that fall within its jurisdiction. To attract and retain quality staff, the committee must be able to offer compensation that is at least somewhat competitive with the private sector. This

is particularly challenging when a disproportionate number of committee staff are attorneys, with substantial experience and public policy expertise who could command higher salaries from the private sector.

In addition to the personnel that are necessary to manage the demanding workload of the Judiciary Committee, there are operating funds that will be critical in enabling the committee to properly investigate certain policy issues under its jurisdiction. For example, I believe that it is an important function of the committee to conduct field hearings on certain complex issues, such as immigration reform, where a full evaluation of the issue is not possible without seeing firsthand how the current programs operate and to better understand the successes and deficiencies of the current law.

Furthermore, one of the commitments that I made when I became chairman of the Judiciary Committee is that the committee would build a new cutting-edge Web site to replace the outdated Web site that currently exists. It is a disservice to the Members of the House and the public to not provide user-friendly, current, transparent information about the important issues being considered by the Judiciary Committee. And therefore, rebuilding the committee's Web site is a top priority.

While I will do what is necessary to ensure that the Judiciary Committee is even more productive while operating with less, I respectfully request that when allocating funds to committees, you take into account the legislative burden of the committee and whether it will require more resources when compared with other committees.

Lastly, I note that our budget submission continues our commitment to give the minority one-third of the staff slots and one-third of the salaries after subtracting shared administrative expenses and staff.

And I thank you for your time, and yield back.

[The statement of Mr. Goodlatte follows:]

Statement of Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte
Committee on House Administration
Judiciary Committee Budget for the 113th Congress, First Session
Wednesday, March 6, 2013

Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Brady and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the Judiciary Committee's budget for the First Session of the 113th Congress.

In this economy all Americans are forced to tighten their belts and do more with less. I recognize that and the Judiciary Committee is prepared to do the same. However, Ranking Member Conyers and I would like to make the case before you today that the Judiciary Committee is deserving of the maximum amount of funds that you can dedicate to it.

Historically, the Judiciary Committee is one of the most active Committees in the House. In the 112th Congress, for example, over 14.5% of the total

legislative measures introduced were referred to this Committee. The Judiciary Committee reported 77 bills and resolutions to the House, with accompanying legislative reports on all but a few. In addition, a total of 42 bills in which the Judiciary Committee had a jurisdictional interest were signed into law by the President. Already in the 113th Congress, the Judiciary Committee has been hard at work to meet the demands of the heavy workload of the committee, including work on issues of great importance to the entire Congress. One only needs to pick up a newspaper and read the headlines to appreciate how busy the Judiciary Committee has been and will continue to be this year as we consider such issues as immigration reform and firearms in addition to our normal heavy workload. We also expect to increase the Committee's efforts to engage in aggressive oversight this Congress.

Among the important issues the Committee continues to consider are ensuring that federal law enforcement agencies have the necessary tools to prevent terrorist attacks; that the Constitutional rights and civil liberties of Americans are protected; that America's borders are secure; and that the administration of justice is fair and efficient within both the Justice Department and federal law enforcement agencies and within our federal judiciary.

In addition, the Committee plays an important role in strengthening our economy and putting Americans back to work. We ensure robust and fair competition under the antitrust laws, encourage innovation and promote America's global competitiveness through our intellectual property laws, improve our immigration laws to attract the best and brightest from around the world and bolster the business climate by providing relief from burdensome and excessive regulations.

These issues are critical to the safety and economic well-being of millions of Americans.

Because of this, it is vital that we retain a highly qualified staff as the cornerstone of the Committee's capacity to consider complicated and often controversial legislation and policy issues that fall within its jurisdiction.

To attract and retain quality staff, the Committee must be able to offer compensation that is at least somewhat competitive with the private sector.

This is particularly challenging when a disproportionate number of committee staff are attorneys with substantial experience and public policy expertise who could command higher salaries from the private sector.

In addition to the personnel that are necessary to manage the demanding workload of the Judiciary Committee, there are operating funds that will be critical

in enabling the Committee to properly investigate certain policy issues under its jurisdiction. For example, I believe that it is an important function of the Committee to conduct field hearings on certain complex issues, such as immigration reform, where a full evaluation of the issue is not possible without seeing firsthand how the current programs operate and to better understand the successes and deficiencies of the current law.

Furthermore, one of the commitments that I made when I became Chairman of the Judiciary Committee is that the Committee would build a new, cutting-edge website to replace the outdated website that currently exists. It is a disservice to the members of the House and the public to not provide user-friendly, current, transparent information about the important issues being considered by the Judiciary Committee and

therefore, rebuilding the Committee's website is a top priority.

While I will do what is necessary to ensure that the Judiciary Committee is even more productive while operating with less, I respectfully request that when allocating funds to committees, you take into account the legislative burden of the committee and whether it will require more resources when compared with other committees.

I thank you for your time and yield back the balance of my time.

###

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman very much.

And at this time, the chair recognizes the ranking member, Mr. Conyers.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Chairwoman Candice Miller, and of course, the ranking member, Mr. Brady, and Zoe Lofgren, who is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, as well as this responsibility, and Mr. Harper of Mississippi. We are all glad to be here with you.

My chairman has done an excellent job of describing our situation, our responsibilities, and what our ask is. I ask unanimous consent to put my statement in the record in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you. And I probably won't have to read it all because much of it is repetitive. But the 2013 budget request for the House Judiciary Committee is very important. I would like to tell you that when I first came to the Congress, John W. McCormack was the Speaker of the House. And I came to him and I asked him, before I had gotten an assignment, that I be assigned to the Judiciary Committee. It was the committee handling the civil rights activities, which, in the 1960s, was really going on at a very high pace. And I told him that that was a request I would like to have passed on. At that time, from Arkansas, his name escapes me right now, but he was the chairman of this committee. It was a Democrat. And he, I went before him, and they acceded to my request. And I was very, very pleased to start my career out on the Judiciary Committee.

The chairman at that time was the late Emanuel Celler of New York, who handled most of the civil rights activity during that period. And during many of those years, there were Republican chairmen of the House Judiciary Committee. And we got along quite well, as we still do today under Bob Goodlatte's leadership.

So I join with the chairman in requesting that we allocate as much as we can, the maximum amount of budget for the committee to reflect some of the critical issues.

The chair, Ms. Miller, has already outlined our constitutional responsibilities, and so I am sure everyone is aware of them: 77 bills in the last Congress; one in eight of the legislative measures introduced to the House are referred to our committee; and 40 bills signed into law. We had more than 150 subcommittee hearings during the last Congress and 20 full committee hearings and approximately 50 full committee markups. And so our committee plays a major role in dealing with diverse legislative and oversight issues that have national and occasionally global significance.

In any one session of Congress, of course, immigration reform and reduction of gun violence, copyright enforcement, constitutional amendments, voting rights, and criminal law are all part of our day-to-day everyday responsibilities. In addition, we have oversight of the Department of Justice, which is I think a significant responsibility. And we have oversight of the Federal judicial system itself. One of the things that really make this job a treat is that we are able to be invited over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court

to meet with him to discuss our legislative issues and other issues that connect us and the Supreme Court and the rest of the Federal judiciary.

Chairman Goodlatte has explained the other oversight responsibilities, so I won't go into that.

There is one thing I would like to point out, that it could be that our jurisdiction, because of our jurisdiction, the committee workload will increase in this 113th session of Congress. And Chairman Goodlatte has proposed an ambitious hearing and legislative schedule, in which we will be dealing with all of these very current and topical issues that fall within our jurisdiction.

As your committee considers, Madam Chairman, the budget allocations for this year, I urge you to prioritize the Judiciary Committee's budget request based on our extensive legislative responsibilities. And I must point out that, in addition, we received cuts from the 112th Congress that have made us actually have to reduce some staff. And I think that was an 11 percent cut from the 112th committee considerations. So, given the negative ramifications, and our staff does work long hours and are frequently called upon to work at night and sometimes on weekends, so if there were even fewer staff allocated, I am hoping that that could be minimized to the greatest extent possible. The chairman, and I with him, have submitted a budget request before you today that reflects our shared commitment to retaining the most experienced people that we can to support the significant work of the committee. And I am pleased that Chairman Goodlatte is committed to working cooperatively with me in an effort to minimize any impact of funding reductions, and on the workload and assignments that are part of our daily work.

So I thank the members of the committee, appreciate your attention to our request, and hope to be able to persuade you to be as efficient but as generous as possible. I thank the members of the committee.

[The statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]

Statement of The Hon. John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, for the Hearing on the Committee's 2013 Budget Request before the Committee on Administration

Wednesday, March 6, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.
1310 Longworth House Office Building

Chairwoman Miller, Ranking Member Brady, and Members of the Committee, it is my pleasure to appear before you today with Chairman Goodlatte to present our 2013 budget request for the House Judiciary Committee.

I join with my colleague Chairman Goodlatte in requesting that your Committee consider allocating the maximum amount of budget funding possible to the Judiciary Committee.

To begin with, this request reflects the fact that the Judiciary Committee is responsible for some of the most critical issues facing our Nation and is among the most active committees in the House.

For example, during the 112th Congress, our Committee reported 77 substantive bills and resolutions, with 1 in 8 of the legislative measures introduced in the House referred to the Committee. In addition, the Judiciary Committee had a jurisdictional interest in 40 of the bills signed into law during the last Congress.

In the 112th Congress, the Judiciary Committee held more than 150 subcommittee hearings, 20 full Committee hearings, and approximately 50 full committee markups.

Our Committee plays a major role in dealing with diverse legislative and oversight issues that have nationwide significance and affect every American.

In any one session of Congress, we consider legislation dealing with immigration reform, the prevention of gun violence, copyright enforcement, amendments to the constitution, voting rights, and criminal law, to name just a few.

The Committee's responsibilities also include oversight of the Justice Department, as well as the federal court system.

Examples of the Committee's other oversight responsibilities range from the examination of the constitutional issues presented by the use of unmanned drones in the fight against terror, to the complex issues presented by proposed billion dollar mergers, intellectual property disputes and the federal regulatory process.

Such extensive responsibilities obviously require the Committee to expend extensive time and resources, and require a well-qualified and experienced staff.

Given the number and range of nationally important issues within our jurisdiction, it is very likely that the Committee workload will only increase in the 113th Congress.

For example, Chairman Goodlatte has proposed an ambitious hearing and legislative schedule during which the Committee will continue to work on immigration policy, criminal law issues, and patent and copyright concerns, among many others.

In addition, several of these hearings will necessitate travel expenditures, particularly with respect to immigration issues.

As your Committee considers budget allocations for this year, I urge you to prioritize the Judiciary Committee's budget request based on our extensive legislative responsibilities.

I am concerned that any further funding reductions could jeopardize the Committee's ability to retain its highly qualified staff who possess the institutional knowledge and expertise to support the work of the Committee.

As detailed in the budget submission, a cut of 11% from our 2012 Committee allocation may require me to reduce the number of Democratic staff, who already are working long hours and are stretched thin.

Given the severe negative ramifications that could result from fewer staff, I urge your Committee to minimize to the greatest extent possible any further reductions to the Judiciary Committee's budget.

Chairman Goodlatte and I have submitted a budget request before you today that reflects our shared commitment to retaining and building a highly qualified staff to support the ambitious and significant work of the Committee.

I am pleased that Chairman Goodlatte has committed to working cooperatively with me in an effort to minimize the impact of any further funding reductions.

We are working together on the overall salary allocation and Committee expenses and I am confident that we will come to the fairest arrangement.

Members of the Committee, I appreciate your attention to our request, and am happy to respond to any questions you might have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate both the chairman and the ranking member and your comments.

We appreciate your attendance here.

Just a couple of comments.

As I say, we have received all your budget documentation, started taking a look at it. And I think it is important that you detailed out here the possibility of some field hearings, in particular about immigration reform. When you think about comprehensive immigration reform being one of the priorities, I think, for the Congress at this time, so we are certainly cognizant of the fact that the committee does have some rather unique challenges going forward in the 113th. We are looking at some of those kind of things. One thing I would say, whether this is a question or observation, or just sort of throwing something out there for you as an offer, this committee has really tried to do some enterprise types of projects that could resource the respective committees in particular ways. I am talking about IT, like the House cloud. I am not sure exactly if the committee has had an opportunity to be utilizing some of the various enterprise platforms that this committee has made available. We are going to try do a better job with the Wi-Fi service on the Hill, as you perhaps go to paperless kinds of committee hearings, so that everybody would have good reception for their iPads, et cetera.

I was sort of looking through some of the detail you provided about your Web site, for instance, rebuilding your Web site, et cetera. This is an area I think our committee could probably, hopefully, if you think it is appropriate, make some resourcing available to you. These are not huge ticket items, but it could add up a bit and help you with your staffing, et cetera. You would be able to—you know, money is fungible—use it in other ways as you see most appropriate. So I offer that to you. And if there are any comments or questions you have in regard to that.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank you for your recommendations, Chairman.

You are quite right that this new technology offers us an easier and more efficient way to communicate and keep everyone in the country involved and up to date on our developments. We will continue to look at that.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Thank you, Madam Chairman. We will definitely take you up on that offer. And we have hired a new IT person to head our efforts there. We think the committee's work in that area needs to be improved, particularly with regard to the Web site, and we will be looking for help and resources wherever we can find them to accomplish that. And we are looking at using the Library of Congress upstream as a way to modernize our Web site and to increase the transparency of the committee, which we think is also important for us to do. So I definitely welcome any way that you can help us.

As you have noted, we do have a heavy burden, heavy workload anyway, and anticipating that sequestration would cause us to incur some reductions, coming in as a new chairman we made some very tough personnel decisions. But at the end of that, we have some very particular needs, and we also have some additional work

that was perhaps not anticipated just a few months ago related to both Second Amendment issues and immigration issues.

So anything you can do to help us level the resources available to committees based upon the amount of work that needs to be produced by those committees would be helpful to the Judiciary Committee because I think we do as much as any committee in the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

At this time, I recognize the ranking member, Mr. Brady.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

My only comment and issue, as I have with all the other committees, and especially your committee, because you have a certain quality and expertise of people that, attorneys you need to hire, is your ability to hire people at the salary that is three or four times less than they can make on the outside and also the ability to keep the people with the institutional knowledge that you do have working there that came in at a relatively low salary and then asking them to take another cut. My issue and my concern is whether we get, not only your committee, but all committees, whether we keep the ability to be able to keep the people and hire new people.

And with that, as the ranking member made note of, you have a senior member of your committee and a valued member of our committee right here who has much more knowledge about your workings than I do, so I would like to yield the remainder of my time to Ms. Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Brady.

I actually think that these reductions, given what the committee is facing, are probably unwise. And I would not say that, and I have not said that to other committees. But if we in fact are going to move into the very complex area of reform of immigration law, that is a massive effort. And, you know, cutting personnel is not going to make us better able to do that. So I have a concern about that.

I also wanted to ask, it is my understanding on the Democratic side, that the staff is each being asked to take a 20 percent reduction in salary. Is that correct, Mr. Conyers?

Mr. CONYERS. I think that it is. I want to be accurate. That is a worst-case scenario. Although just this morning, we were going over this, and we had one lawyer, of course unnamed, that we had just been able to raise up after months of working below the rates of compensation for the other attorneys to get back at a level. So when you take into consideration the sequester effect and the fact that there was a reduction in the 112th Congress, I think the case that we are putting forward is not an overexaggeration of the need for you to consider all these factors and the quality and the significance of the issues that we are called upon to handle, as you well know.

You have been a subcommittee chair as well as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, so I know that you can verify everything that me and Chairman Goodlatte have remarked about here today.

Ms. LOFGREN. I guess I am just wondering if there are ways to economize in other areas, because when I think about, for example, some of the lawyers, and I think that on both sides of the aisle,

these are attorneys who took a pay cut to come, in most cases, from the private sector for the chance to work on the public's business, and so they didn't come here to make money, but at some point, if you can't make your car payments, you can't do this. So I am just wondering, are there ways to economize to prevent further reductions in salary? Because I think it is going to impinge the capacity of the committee on both sides of the aisle to do the really important work that the Congress has entrusted with us.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, Congresswoman Lofgren, as you noted, the committee is, and as you know, we are already hard at work on immigration reform, and we are going to continue that. It is not an easy topic. It is going to take a while to get through that. So, virtually all of this year, we are going to be very dedicated to doing that. We have some great attorneys, many with outstanding backgrounds and previous experience and degrees from America's top universities. And they work for the Judiciary Committee because they want to be involved in these public policy issues, but they are paid substantially less than they would earn in the private sector.

We had the advantage, if you can call it that, coming in as a new chairman, of going through the entire staff and making tough decisions prior to my taking office as chairman, to anticipate the sequestration. And we have reached out to Ranking Member Conyers and his chief of staff to work with them to help find ways so that they don't experience that kind of a pay cut. We do not want to see that happen.

But both in terms of our need for additional employees that we did not fill because of the anticipation of the problem, but not anticipating that we would be spending so much on immigration and virtually every subcommittee on the committee has a heavy workload, but some heavier than was anticipated, and their need to not cut back on great people that they have on their side, we really could use consideration by your committee that our cut not be comparable to some other committees that—and I don't want to get involved in naming anybody—but that may not have that kind of workload or the need to have as many attorneys as the Judiciary Committee that by the very nature of its work needs to have.

Ms. LOFGREN. May I ask, and I don't know if we are in a position to do this, but given the two hot-button issues that are facing the Congress in terms of the Second Amendment and immigration reform, whether you could provide a modest sum that might allow the committee to better meet those challenges if we were to take a look at that. I don't know. I mean, I don't know whether the committee is even willing to do that. But if we cannot actually step forward and discharge our obligations, the whole Congress is going to suffer in that regard. Do you have what the amount would be if we were to do a minor adjustment to deal with those two issues?

Mr. CONYERS. Not on me at the moment, but I could certainly submit it for the record, and I would be pleased to do that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. We would be happy to. We have given our overall budget recommendations, and we would ask that consideration be given for that. But we would be happy to provide any supplemental information.

Ms. LOFGREN. I would just note, just by way of precedent, a couple of years ago, the committee did give an augmentation to the

Ethics Committee because of the workload that they had. And, you know, every committee is going to come in and say our workload is crushing, and that is true, but there sometimes are circumstances where there are anomalies that we have to cope with. And this may be one of those cases.

Could I ask just one more question, and then I won't take my time?

Mr. Goodlatte, I want to make sure that the entire legislative history of the committee is available on our Web sites. And that used to be the case. I was actually thinking about referring somebody to some testimony that was received when I chaired the subcommittee, and I found, much to my dismay, that all of it was gone. Storage is cheap. I think it has now been restored. But I think that the obligation, no matter which party has the majority and who is chair, that that is the history of the committee, all of the testimony ought to be available on the Web site for all of the subcommittees.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I agree, both from the standpoint of doing proper research, and also from the standpoint of transparency. I think the chairwoman's offer with regard to help from this committee, and again, our new technology folks will definitely work with the House Administration Committee on use of cloud technology, for example, so that there should be no problems with storage of information.

And access and good search capabilities as well. Our Web site is woefully in need of improvement, and we are dedicated to doing that.

Ms. LOFGREN. I appreciate that. I look forward to working with you on that.

I thank you, Madam Chairperson.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentlelady for her comments.

And at this time, the chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Harper.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And welcome to both of you. And thanks for the great job that you are doing.

I had the privilege of serving in the 111th Congress of serving on Judiciary, and Mr. Conyers, you as chairman.

And I noticed the committee has always had a great working relationship across the aisle, and I know that you are continuing that tradition, Mr. Chairman, and appreciate that hard work in difficult times, particularly on the budget side of things and trying to do this.

In 2011, there was a 5 percent cut and 6.4 percent in 2012. And while nobody likes to see that, it appeared to me that you did an incredible job on those restrictions and less funds that you had available. Am I correct in that, in the 112th, that you met your obligations during that time?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Yes. I was not chairman then, but certainly we met the targets that we were responsible for. And we also anticipated that there might be further cuts by not filling all positions. And not all positions need to be filled. But I would also argue to the committee that because of the work that we are now undertaking, some of which came about without anticipation—not that

we wouldn't be working on immigration law. The nationwide push and the nationwide interest in doing comprehensive immigration reform is a good development. And we want to take full advantage of it. We need to have the right people to do it.

And we have other similar burdens. And we have short-changed other subcommittees in order to be able to do that. So our request to have some help with some personnel would be very important to us and very welcome if you can favorably respond.

Mr. HARPER. And I know we mentioned a number of areas that it would be very important in this Congress. Are there any other special circumstances that you think the committee should be aware of as we try to set these figures?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, other than to say that there are positions that the committee needs to have related to specific areas of the law, antitrust law, for example, where we need to have the resources so that as we do the extra work that is needed in immigration, for example, we are not short-changing a huge area of jurisdiction in importance to the committee, and that is oversight. I mean, virtually every other week, we have a major antitrust issue that the committee needs to be looking at. Last week, it was the merger of American Airlines and U.S. Air. That is a very important thing that our antitrust laws play very heavily into. And we need to have the expertise in that area available to the members of the committee.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back.

Mr. CONYERS. Could I just add on just briefly?

Antitrust is a huge area. But the other area, Mr. Harper, that is—I don't know if it is going to become a growing concern yet because we haven't had a chance to look at it carefully, but in the voting of last year in November, there were many reports that there were long lines and a lot of waiting. I think some people, I hate to say this, even in Michigan, there were 1- and 2-hour waits in some places. And in some States, there were even more than that, which we wanted to look at. I don't know if it is going to be big enough or consume any more of our staff than we can afford, but it is something that I wanted to mention here at this committee hearing.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate both of the comments. I will just say, as a former Secretary of State of Michigan, chief elections officer, I am not aware of anybody waiting that long of time. But I am appreciative of those comments, and will certainly look at that.

I appreciate both of you coming, the chairman and the ranking member. Again, we have had a good discussion. And the committee will take every due consideration of the very good documentation you put forward and your requests for your budget. Thank you very much both of you.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee now welcomes Chairman Lucas and Ranking Member Peterson of the Committee on Agriculture.

The official reporter will enter a page break as we record a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee on Ag has jurisdiction over agricultural policies generally, agricultural production and marketing, stabilization of prices of agricultural products and commodities, commodity exchanges, crop insurance and soil conservation and the expansion—excuse me—extension of farm credit and farm security.

During the 113th, the committee's priorities include working on a farm bill, guarding against and stopping unnecessary regulations, and ensuring our WTO and trading partners allow fair access for American products and commodities.

So we appreciate both the chairman and the ranking member being here. The committee has had an opportunity to look at all of the budget documentation that you have submitted, and we appreciate your attention to all of that detail.

And at this time, the chair would recognize the chairman, Mr. Lucas.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LUCAS. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and members of the committee for this opportunity to speak with you today.

I appreciate Ranking Member Collin Peterson joining me to outline our committee's proposed budget for the next year. As all you know, we have had a very long and proud history of bipartisan cooperation, and I plan to continue that spirit of cooperation as we proceed with the work of the committee in the 113th Congress.

In addition to bipartisanship, the committee has a long history of fiscal responsibility. The modest spending and cooperative nature of our committee spans back more than two decades under the control of both parties.

With the impending expiration authorizations of both the 2008 Farm Bill and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, we have a significant workload ahead of us in this Congress; therefore, we are proposing level funding for the committee for the 113th Congress.

The resources provided us will allow us to write both of these comprehensive pieces of legislation as well as proceed with a robust oversight agenda, as outlined in our oversight plan submitted to you earlier this year.

With significant cuts in the 112th Congress and the budget uncertainty, we were unable to fill four of our positions on the committee. In addition to those four open slots, we are now down another five staff people, a press person, an investigator and three policy advisors. We have not filled these positions, because we did not know what budget cuts to expect for this year and this Congress. This equals a 28 percent reduction in our staff if we do not fill these open positions.

In response to this budget uncertainty, we have consolidated positions and have eliminated subcommittee staff directors. Unfortunately, this puts our subcommittee chairmen at a disadvantage, as this committee has always been able to provide at least one staff person to serve each of the subcommittee chairmen.

We also reduced the number of subcommittees at the committee from six subcommittees to five subcommittees. And finally, we have done very little travel and limited our field hearings. We are doing everything possible to work more efficiently and effectively.

The committee will continue to support leadership in implementing an additional 11 percent cut, if sequestration takes place. However, I am concerned about the long-term impact on the committee to fulfill its responsibilities, as well as being able to retain qualified, experienced staff. In order to implement this level of cuts, we will have to continue to make very conservative staffing decisions. This will hinder our ability to have an aggressive oversight hearing agenda, and additionally, we will have to continue to limit the number of field hearings and site visits that we would like to do.

However, if the committee allocates a 5 percent increase over our actual spending in 2012, then we should be able to maintain our current staff levels and hire four additional staff members. While we would still be shorthanded under this scenario, we certainly can make it work.

Madam Chair, we truly have our work cut out for us in this Congress, but we firmly believe that we can accomplish all of this, given our current resources.

We greatly appreciate your consideration of our budget request. Please let us know if we can provide any additional information.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

[The statement of Mr. Lucas follows:]

Testimony of Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank D. Lucas House Administration Hearing on Committee Budgets March 6, 2013

Madame Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today. I appreciate Ranking Member Collin Peterson joining me to outline our Committee's proposed budget for the next year. As you all know, we have a long and proud history of bipartisan cooperation, and I plan to continue that spirit of cooperation as we proceed with the work of the Committee in the 113th Congress.

In addition to bipartisanship, the Agriculture Committee has a strong history of fiscal responsibility. The modest spending and cooperative nature of our Committee spans back more than two decades, under the control of both parties.

With the impending expiration authorizations of both the 2008 Farm Bill and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), we have a significant workload ahead of us this Congress. Therefore, we are proposing level funding for the Committee for the 113th Congress. The resources provided to us will allow us to write both of these comprehensive pieces of legislation, as well as proceed with a robust oversight agenda as outlined in our oversight plan submitted to you earlier this year.

With the significant cuts in the 112th Congress, we were unable to fill four positions on our Committee due to budget uncertainty. In addition to those four open slots, we are now down another five staff people – a press person, an investigator, and three policy advisors. We have not filled these positions because we do not know what budget cuts to expect for this year and this Congress. This equals a 28 percent reduction in our staff if we do not fill these open positions.

In response to this budget uncertainty, we have consolidated positions and have eliminated subcommittee staff directors. Unfortunately, this puts our subcommittee chairmen at a disadvantage as this Committee has always been able to provide at least one staff person to serve each of the subcommittee chairmen. We also reduced the number of subcommittees at the Committee from six subcommittees to five subcommittees. Finally, we have done very little travel and limited our field hearings. We are doing everything possible to work more efficiently and effectively.

The Committee will continue to support leadership in implementing an additional 11 percent cut if sequestration takes place. However, I am concerned about the long term impact on the Committee to fulfill its responsibilities, as well as being able to retain qualified, experienced staff. In order to implement this level of cuts, we will have to continue to make conservative staffing decisions. This will hinder our ability to have an aggressive oversight hearing agenda. Additionally, we will have to continue to limit the number of field hearings and site visits that we would like to do.

However, if your Committee allocates a 5 percent increase over our actual spending in 2012, then we should be able to maintain our current staffing levels and hire four additional staff members. While we would still be short handed under this scenario, we can certainly make it work.

Madame Chair, we truly have our work cut out for us this Congress. But we firmly believe that we can accomplish all of this given our current resources. We greatly appreciate your consideration of our budget request. Please let us know if we can provide you any additional information.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the chairman very much.

At this time, we recognize the ranking member, Mr. Peterson.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and Ranking Member Brady and members of the committee. I am pleased to be here today to support the Agricultural Committee's budget request.

As Chairman Lucas has said, the Ag Committee has a history of working in a bipartisan fashion, and not always easy, but we work very hard to listen and understand each other.

As Chairman Lucas has outlined, there are many challenges before us, including completion of the 5-year Farm Bill and the CFTC reauthorization. The farm bill has proven to be a tough project to finish, as you all are aware, but the committee has worked hard over the past couple of years to use all opportunities to get the bill done. So we are going to continue that effort this year, and I hope and expect that it will mean a final farm bill signed into law this year.

Financial reform oversight will continue to be a focus for the committee as we consider CFTC reauthorization. And we need to make sure that we do not repeat some of the mistakes of the past with regard to financial sector regulation.

The public record shows that we are a frugal committee. We strive to use our resources and staff as efficiently and effectively as possible.

And through our work, Chairman Lucas has been fair to the minority. We have no complaints about the division of resources. The majority has worked to protect the rights of the minority, and we appreciate the chairman's efforts in that regard. It helps make the rest of our work all the easier when we agree on policy decisions and, perhaps more importantly, when we disagree on policy.

So I thank the committee today for the opportunity to visit with you and your important work on behalf of the House, and appreciate your consideration of the Ag Committee's budget request. Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Peterson follows:]

Testimony of Agriculture Committee Ranking Member Collin C. Peterson House Administration Hearing on Committee Budgets March 6, 2013

Madame Chairman and members of the Committee, I am pleased to be here today in support of the Agriculture Committee's budget request. As Chairman Lucas has said, the Agriculture Committee has a history of working in a bipartisan fashion. It's not always easy, but we work very hard to listen and understand each other.

As Chairman Lucas has outlined, there are many challenges before us, including the completion of a five-year farm bill and CFTC reauthorization. The farm bill has proven to be a tough project to finish. The Committee has worked hard over the past couple of years to use all opportunities to get the bill done. We will continue the effort this year which I hope and expect will mean a final bill signed into law. Financial reform oversight will continue to be a focus for the Committee as we consider CFTC reauthorization. We need to make sure that we do not repeat some of the mistakes of the past with financial sector regulation.

The public record shows that we are a frugal committee. We strive to use our resources and staff as efficiently and effectively as possible. Through our work, Chairman Lucas has been fair to the minority. We have no complaints about the division of resources by two-thirds and one-third. The majority has worked to protect the rights of the minority. We appreciate the Chairman's efforts in this regard. It helps make the rest of our work all the easier when we agree on policy decisions and, perhaps more importantly, when we disagree on policy.

I thank the Committee today for the opportunity to visit with you about your important work on behalf of the House. I appreciate your consideration of the Agriculture Committee's budget request.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you, gentlemen, both very, very much, and you do have some unique challenges, certainly, as we go into this Congress with the farm bill.

Sometimes people say, why is the farm bill so important? Well, if you like to eat, maybe it is important. If you don't care about eating, maybe you don't care, right? But it is critically important for our country.

And we certainly all appreciate the bipartisanship that the committee has always demonstrated, and hope you are going to be very successful with that this year.

Just a couple of things. As I say, we have looked at the detail. I was just looking at all the vacancies that you have in both the majority and the minority on the committee. We are certainly cognizant of that. I know you have detailed out here a bit for field hearings perhaps on your farm bill as well, which I think is certainly an appropriate thing.

Just one thing I would say, it is a question or a comment, or sort of throwing it out there for you. One of things that our committee has, this committee has done very well in the past and really want to ratchet up here a bit is to help resource the respective committees with perhaps IT kinds of things that you are utilizing, some new technologies. We know we need to have a little bit better Wi-Fi service on the Hill as you possibly go to paperless committee hearings, those kinds of things, to make sure your iPads are working properly, et cetera.

I was sort of trying to look through some of the detail you gave about various kinds of things that you have done with IT. It looks like you have sort of purchased your own software agreement, et cetera, rather than using the House cloud. And I guess I just offer that up as perhaps whether there are any of the enterprise kinds of foundations, projects that this committee is working on that would assist your committee, we certainly want to stand by and do that however we go, whether that is Web site development, whatever it is.

So not really so much in the form of a question, but want to help if we can on things that you think might be appropriate.

Mr. LUCAS. Absolutely, Chairman.

We have some very good IT people on the staff and working in whatever way will make the systems more efficient. I know that there have been efforts to try and address the committee providing resources for all committees, subscription costs and all those sort of things. We are willing to look at those. Collin and I have run this ship in a very frugal fashion, and we are going to continue to do that. Whatever help you can provide, we will be very pleased with.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. At this time, I recognize my ranking member, Mr. Brady.

No questions.

At this time, the chair recognizes Mr. Harper.

Mr. HARPER. I just want to thank you for what you are doing, and under somewhat less than perfect circumstances, I think you have done a commendable job on the committee. And we will—though these are not the best days to set things, but are there any special circumstances, Chairman Lucas, that you think the com-

mittee needs to be aware of as we are trying to set the amounts for each committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I would just note that as we work through this farm bill process, having to reduce the number of staff people who work with the subcommittee chairmen means that our additional staff have to work a lot of overtime. And I would say this: the people who work on the Ag Committee, the lawyers and the economists, the policy folks are very focused on this subject matter and are willing to go to great lengths to get the mission done.

If we don't return to some sort of normal funding levels in the future, I can see once the 5-year farm bill is done, a potential for desertion amongst these good, overworked folks. I want to maintain that skill set, and knowledge for oversight and all the things that come after that.

So, I just observe that our folks are going to do everything that is necessary to get this farm bill done, but after that, I may have a hard time retaining them when the adrenaline of the farm bill process is over.

Mr. HARPER. Just so you know, Mr. Chairman, the staff behind you did a good job of holding their applause when you said that. So thank you for your time.

And I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. We certainly—again, we appreciate both the chairman and the ranking member being in attendance today. The committee is going to give every serious consideration to your budget requests, which are very well thought out, and certainly we are very cognizant of the challenges that you face with the farm bill, et cetera. And all these vacancies and the budget constraints that you have been operating under, we are appreciative of that, and we will look at it all. Thank you very, very much. We appreciate you both coming. Thank you.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. All right. In the interest of time, we will take the written testimony from Chairman Ryan, and we would ask the ranking member if he has any comment in regard to the budget.

[The statement of Mr. Ryan follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL D. RYAN
CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
March 6, 2013

Thank you, Chairman Miller and Congressman Brady, for the opportunity to testify concerning the Budget Committee's funding request for 2013.

The Budget Committee has requested a flat budget for the past 8 years and we have kept spending within the levels approved by this Committee. I have worked to maintain the disciplined approach to our budget that is a bipartisan tradition of the Budget Committee. For example, Chairman Spratt operated the committee well within its authorized level. I am determined to continue this prudent stewardship of our budget going forward.

Last year was an extraordinary year with large demands on the committee's resources. In addition to committee approval and House passage of the fiscal year 2013 budget resolution, we approved and passed through the House several budget process reform measures, including the bipartisan Expedited Line-Item Veto and Rescissions Act which was sponsored by Mr. Van Hollen and me. We also reported and moved through the House the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act that would have replaced the impending automatic spending cuts with other spending reforms. We also, on a bipartisan basis, reported and passed through the House the Sequestration Transparency Act which the President signed into law in August. This legislation gave us important advance information about the sequester. Our work was also devoted to the fiscal cliff, debt ceiling, the sequester, and the continuing resolution.

As you examine the Budget Committee's actual expenditures from last year, I ask that you keep in mind that they were unusually low due to special one-time factors. As you know, in addition to running for Congress, I pursued another office last year. In addition, five members of my Budget Committee staff requested and were granted leave without pay from the Committee in accordance with House rules. Due to uncertainty associated with these factors, two existing vacancies for senior staff positions on my Budget Committee staff were not filled.

We at the Budget Committee have prided ourselves on living within the funds with which we have been provided. In addition, regardless of which party has been in the Majority, we have always fostered a collegial relationship on the issue of the Committee's budget. We have a bipartisan tradition regarding the allocation of resources between the Majority and Minority. The Majority makes at least one-third of the personnel budget available to the Minority, and this is the largest area of our spending needs. Equipment for both the Majority and Minority then comes out of the common fund, on the same schedule, and with the same quality, for both sides.

This year's budget proposal continues that tradition. I believe our request is a disciplined budget that treats the Minority fairly, and I believe Mr. Van Hollen's testimony supports both our budget request and our plans for the management of committee funds.

I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. I will tell you, sir, that the committee has received all the documentation that you have submitted. We have looked at it. We appreciate it.

We are especially appreciative of how fiscally conservative the Budget Committee has been in regards to you have really been walking the walk there, and the committee is well aware of that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you have any comments—

STATEMENT OF THE HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, thank you, Madam Chairman, Ranking Member Brady, committee members. I appreciate those comments. I do have a written statement to submit for the record.

And I know Mr. Ryan would join me in saying that we have had a bipartisan relationship when it comes to dealing with our committee budget issues as they affect the committee, and we have been trying to do a lot more with a lot less. So I thank the members of the committee and hope everyone can get home before the airports close.

[The statement of Mr. Van Hollen follows:]

Statement of Chris Van Hollen
Ranking Democrat, House Budget Committee
March 6, 2013
11:00 a.m.
1310 Longworth House Office Building

Review of the Use of Committee Funds of the 113th Congress

Thank you, Chairman Miller and Ranking Member Brady, for providing this opportunity to testify about the Budget Committee's use of funds in the 113th Congress.

I am pleased to be testifying alongside Chairman Ryan, demonstrating once again that the Budget Committee has a long-standing and proud tradition of bipartisan cooperation and collegiality in requesting and disbursing the Committee's budget.

In keeping with past policies, in the 113th Congress the majority will make one-third of the funding and resources available to the minority for personnel. The majority budget continues to cover costs of equipment for both staffs, providing the same quality and services for both majority and minority.

The current cut in federal spending under sequestration requires the federal government to continue functioning with less funding. And in fact, the minority Committee staff has already been doing more with less. As my colleague pointed out, in addition to marking up a budget resolution each year, we marked up and brought to the floor several bills making budget process changes, and last year held a reconciliation bill markup and then considered the bill on the floor twice. Our staff also participated in the deficit talks chaired by Vice President Biden and the subsequent debt ceiling issues and the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction in 2011, and in the fiscal cliff negotiations at the end of 2012.

In the last year, our minority staff had some staff retirements and other departures, and we lowered our expenditures significantly by leaving the vacancies for several months. But last year's low annual payroll does not reflect what it will take to for us to operate this year now that we have filled the necessary vacancies. We are very fortunate to have an excellent and productive staff that we want to keep. It's important that they receive fair compensation commensurate with their credentials and hard work. We are competing with organizations in the private sector for those with the specific skills and knowledge of federal budgeting, and if we continue to cut pay, we will inevitably lose some of our best staff.

The Budget Committee has a long history of being frugal with our federal funds. We will continue that trend going forward as we grapple with the challenge of putting the federal budget on a fiscally sustainable path.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good. Thank you so much.

We appreciate your attendance.

Any comment from the ranking member?

Mr. Harper, any comment?

Mr. HARPER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Very well. Thank you so much.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in recess.

[Recess.]

Mr. HARPER [presiding]. We will now reconvene the Committee on House Administration to continue the hearing on committee funding for the 113th Congress. A quorum is present, so we may proceed.

The committee now welcomes Chairman Hastings and Ranking Member Markey of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Would the official reporter please enter a page break into the hearing record to begin a new section?

Mr. HARPER. With a history dating back to the Louisiana Purchase, the Committee on Natural Resources has a proud history and jurisdiction over our Nation's energy and mineral resources, fisheries and wildlife, affairs related to our Native American communities, our water and power resources, and our public lands and environmental regulations.

Its priorities in the 113th Congress will be to continue to maximize our Nation's great natural assets and lower energy costs for millions of Americans while stifling job-killing and industry-harming regulations.

Chairman Hastings and Ranking Member Markey, welcome.

You will have 5 minutes to testify before the committee.

I will now recognize the chair.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. DOC HASTINGS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member, for the opportunity to discuss the work of the Committee on Natural Resources and to present our 2013 budget requests.

The Natural Resources Committee is a real work horse in the House, to a degree that I do not believe is widely obvious to all. A quick look at the statistics of the legislative activity of the committee in the 112th Congress best demonstrates just how heavy a workload the Natural Resources Committee and its staff perform for the House.

Last Congress, the committee ranked fourth in total bills referred to it, nearly 700; first in the number of bills reported out of committee; first in bill reports filed; first in number of bills passed by the House, over 100; fourth in bills considered under a rule; third in public laws enacted; and fifth in total hearings among the authorizing committee, over 200.

The committee's jurisdiction under House Rule X is deep and broad. As you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, we must maintain a diverse staff with specialized expertise on diverse matters ranging from offshore energy production, to 398 National Park units, to National Forests and the ensuing fires, wildfires on those forests; to over 560 wildlife refuges; to commercial and recreational fisheries;

to 566 recognized Indian tribes; to all mining and minerals and coal production; to Federal hydropower and western irrigation products; to our overseas territory; and to ocean and wildlife generally, including the endangered species.

These activities all have tremendous impact on our Nation's economy and the Federal budget. There are areas in our Nation suffering severe economic hardship and double-digit unemployment. Many of these areas have a direct connection to our Federal lands, Federal policies and Federal laws, and many of these areas are subject to laws subject to reauthorization under our committee's jurisdiction.

Many do not realize the committee is responsible for one of the largest sources of nontax revenue in the Federal Government in the form of oil and natural gas leasing and production. Between 2008 and 2012, approximately $1 billion to $2 billion every month was collected by the Interior Department from this development.

The committee's ability to uphold this workload and fulfill our duties to the House is directly reliant on the committee staff. It is for these reasons we have acted aggressively over the past 2 years to reduce our nonstaff salary budget. In total, the committee has reduced its nonstaff salary budget by over 50 percent from the amount spent in 2010 to the amount proposed in 2013. These costs now represent just 6 percent of our total budget, and our staff salary represents 94 percent of the budget.

Even with making these deep cuts to form a lean, efficient operating budget, the reductions to the personnel budget have already affected the ability of both the majority and the minority to hire and retain staff. Further reductions would directly impact our existing staff.

And it is for these reasons that I am requesting a budget for 2013 that reflects a freeze from what we had in 2012. However, should the sequester be maintained government-wide for all of the fiscal year 2013, I want to assure you that the committee will certainly fulfill its duty to execute the choices that we would have been required to do, but to be clear, a full-year sequester equaling 11 percent reduction would require impactful adjustments to the existing staff of the committee. It would reduce the committee's budget by over $800,000.

For the majority, positions identified as core capabilities just last year would now go unfilled and positions occupied at the beginning of the year would need to be vacant by the end of the year. The majority already has three staff spots permanently unfilled under the sequester, and it would grow to at least six, meaning that one in 70 majority staff positions would be unfilled.

The House as an institution asks and receives a great deal from our committee. We very capably perform both legislatively and reducing our budget to a core operating level, so we ask you for your consideration for all of this hard work as you review and determine our budget for 2013.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to any questions that you may have.

[The statement of Mr. Hastings follows:]

Prepared Statement of
Doc Hastings, Chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources
before the
Committee on House Administration
Wednesday, March 6, 2013

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the work of the Committee on Natural Resources and to present a 2013 budget request.

The budget request submitted for consideration reflects a freeze at the amount allocated for 2012. Information submitted also includes 1) actual funds spent in 2012, 2) the impact of an 11% reduction from the 2012 allocation, and 3) a 5% increase over actual 2012 spending.

Recent Budget Reductions

Two years ago, I had the privilege of becoming Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee following the 2010 election of a new Republican Majority. At the outset of this new Majority, the Committee budget request proposed for 2011 and 2012 reflected a real reduction of 5% from the total allocation of the 111th Congress. In practical terms, this meant the Committee's budget was reduced 6.8% from 2010 to 2011. At the beginning of 2012, a further reduction of 6.4% was made to the Committee's budget. This unanticipated reduction of $503,665 in 2012 required finding even greater efficiencies as the top priority was maintaining personnel and technical expertise.

Following these reductions, the 2012 allocation is 12.7% less than the Committee received in 2010, which means the Committee is operating with $1,076,000 less than three years ago.

Aggressive efforts have been made over the past two years to reduce non-personnel/salary categories of the budget. Every category has seen reductions. The number of phones used has been reduced. Web services for Majority and Minority websites has been reduced. Supply costs have been reduced by seeking outside vendors with lower prices. A number of subscriptions have been eliminated, while lower prices negotiated for others. Training was halted. Equipment replacement costs have been revaluated and are reviewed annually. The travel budget has also been reduced significantly to a base level.

In total, the Committee has reduced the non-personnel/salary categories of the budget by 50.5% from 2010 to the amount proposed for 2013 ($844,748 reduced to $418,101.)

The overriding goal of these deep reductions has been to operate as efficiently as possible and dedicate as much of the Committee's resources to maintaining personnel as possible. It is important that the Committee have the staff needed to fulfill its mission and the workload

expected of it by the House. However, the reductions to the personnel/salary category have directly affected the ability of both the Majority and Minority to hire and retain staff.

As the non-personnel/salary budget categories have been reduced, the percentage of the Committee's budget allocated to personnel-allocation has grown. Under the 2013 request that the Committee has submitted (for a freeze at the 2012 allocation), personnel/salary will represent 94.3% of the Committee's budget.

2013 Committee Budget Request

With this high percentage of the Committee's budget dedicated to personnel/salary, further reductions would directly impact the existing staff of the Majority and Minority. Even freezing the 2013 budget at the 2012 allocation, which is the Committee's request, would apply difficult pressure to the staffing capability of the Majority and Minority as each strives to maintain the expertise it needs to uphold its responsibilities to the House.

Efforts to reduce non-personnel/salary budget categories have continued throughout 2012 and for 2013, and the extra savings will be applied to personnel/salary. Comparing 2013 to 2012, travel, website services, supplies, printing, and equipment are all reduced. The one new expenditure ($3000) for 2013 is for security training for IT staff that has been deferred for the past two years, which cannot be responsibly postponed further.

Regarding the travel budget, the amount allocated in the 2013 proposal ($50,000) reflects a 75% reduction from the amount allocated in 2011 and represents less than the amount actually spent on travel in 2012, which was low to avoid an potential appearance of controversy in an election year. In each of the budget scenarios presented to you, the travel budget has been set at $50,000 to ensure that the Committee maintains a core capability to respond to events, such as occurred in the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, as well as to be able to travel to those areas of the country directly affected by the Committee's policies, especially to those areas suffering severe economic hardship and double-digit unemployment levels with a direct connection to federal lands, policies or laws due for reauthorization.

Comparing the Committee's request for 2013 for a freeze at the 2012 allocation to the amount actually spent in 2012, the difference is approximately $170,000 and is attributable to intentional delays in hiring by the Majority in mid-to-late 2012. While the staff may not be needed from August to December of an election year when Committee activities were at their lightest, they are a necessity at the outset of the 113th Congress and President Obama's second term.

Comparing the Committee's request for 2013 for a freeze at the 2012 allocation to 5% above the amount actually spent in 2012, this would be an increase in the Committee's budget over the amount allocated in 2012. While the Committee would certainly be grateful for such an

increase, due to these fiscal times, a freeze at the 2012 allocation is requested. For illustration purposes, a 5% increase would primarily be dedicated to personnel/salary with discreet amounts restored to the training, web services, supplies and equipment categories (a total of $43,000) to bring them to a more sustainable level, as the other budget scenarios reduce these below the amounts expected to be needed in the long-term.

Comparing the Committee's request for 2013 for a freeze at the 2012 allocation to an 11% reduction below the 2012 allocation, it is understood that this would represent the effect of sequestration. Should the sequester be executed and maintained government-wide for all of Fiscal Year 2013, the Committee will certainly fulfill its duty to execute the difficult choices such an outcome would require. Should the sequester reductions in government spending be replaced by other reductions, the Committee would work to make the decisions necessary to implement a partial year sequester. The request for a freeze at the 2012 allocation for 2013 will take careful management, and an 11% sequester reduction would require real, impactful adjustments to the existing staff of the Committee. A full sequester for 2013 equal to an 11% reduction would reduce the Committee's budget by $810,271. Personnel/salary would be reduced by $750,000 and slightly over $60,000 would come from the already reduced non-personnel/salary categories of the budget. This $750,000 reduction in staff funding would reflect the 2/3-to1/3 divide between the Majority and Minority. The Majority would lose $500,000 in the salary budget for staff, and the Minority would lose $250,000. A loss of this amount would result in the Majority having a more than $1 million lower salary budget than the Democrat Majority on the Committee had in 2010. And the Majority staff budget would be over $600,000 less than the original salary budget allocated to the new Republican Majority on the Committee in 2011. For the Majority, positions identified as core capabilities just last year would go unfilled and positions occupied at the beginning of this year would need to be vacant by the end of the year.

Responsibilities and Workload of the Natural Resources Committee

The Committee's jurisdiction under House Rule X is deep and broad, which necessitates maintaining a diverse staff with specialized expertise, which both the Majority and Minority must strive to accomplish with tightened salary budgets. Hiring and retaining knowledgeable staff to responsibly manage the Committee's activities is increasingly challenging as budgets are reduced, salaries are frozen or stable, and due to increasing competition from other employers. Areas of legislative expertise needed include: offshore and onshore energy production (oil, natural gas and renewable), coal production, mining and minerals, Indian affairs, National Parks, National Forests, forestry and wildfires, other federal lands, Reclamation hydropower dams and irrigation projects, Department of Energy Power Marketing Administrations, fisheries, wildlife, general ocean activities, the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, Territories and Insular Areas, Department of the Interior, NOAA, and more.

To better understand how this jurisdictional list translates into the real, practical world – it represents:

- 566 federally recognized Indian Tribes with 56 million acres of trust land and an enrolled population of 1.9 million American Indians and Alaska Natives;
- 398 National Park Service units (parks, battlefields, trails, historic sites, etc.) encompassing 84 million acres;
- 245 million acres of Bureau of Land Management property;
- 561 wildlife refuge units under the Fish and Wildlife Service comprising 150 million acres of land and water;
- 155 national forests of the Forest Service (shared with Agriculture Committee) covering 193 million acres;
- generation and distribution of 25,566 megawatts of power by the Power Marketing Administrations to 40 million people in 34 states;
- irrigation water delivery to 10 million farmland acres that produce 60 percent of the nation's vegetables and 25% of its fresh fruit and nut crops; and,
- commercial and recreational fisheries that support over 1.5 million jobs and generate $183 billion per year to the economy.

With 69 staff positions, the Committee oversees more than 130,000 federal workers at these departments and agencies with budgets in excess of $15 billion per year.

The Committee is responsible for one of the largest (often the second highest) source of non-tax revenue to the federal government in the form of oil and natural gas leasing and production. Approximately $1 billion per month is collected by the Interior Department from such development – an amount that peaked to over $23 billion in Fiscal Year 2008 and has average $13 billion annually for the past five years.

Statistics from the 112th Congress demonstrate the demands the breadth of our jurisdiction places on Committee staff. Examining summaries of legislative activity for House Committees from the last Congress, the Natural Resources Committee ranked:

- 4th in total bills referred to it (nearly 700);
- 1st in number of bills reported out of Committee (over 100);
- 1st in bill reports filed;
- 1st in number of bills passed by the House;
- 4th in bills considered under a rule;
- 3rd in public laws enacted; and,
- 5th in total hearings held among authorizing committees (over 200).

Not only does the Committee expect to maintain this pace of activity for the 113th Congress, but there are a number of reauthorizations due for action during the next two years, including the

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act that oversees the nation's ocean fisheries and represents a major legislative undertaking.

Conclusion

Thank you again for the opportunity to share this information on the Committee on Natural Resources. I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

Mr. HARPER. Now the chair recognizes Ranking Member Markey.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. EDWARD MARKEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Brady, thank you for having us here. I am here to ask for support for the Natural Resources Committee's budget request for the 113th Congress.

Doc Hastings and I, we have our vigorous disagreements and debates in the Natural Resources Committee, but I wholeheartedly support his presentation of the budget facts as they relate to the impact of the cuts that our committee has experienced over the last 2 years on our ability to carry out the work entrusted to us by the House of Representatives.

In order to be able to carry out the duties entrusted to it by the House over all of these diverse and complex matters, the committee needs a budget that will enable us to do our job. As Chairman Hastings has noted, our committee was already forced to absorb a 6.8 percent cut in funding in 2011 and faced a further reduction of 6.4 percent last year. These reductions mean that the committee is now operating with a budget that is 12.7 percent less than what it received in 2010, a reduction of more than $1 million in funding.

The committee and its staff have worked long and hard to prevent these prior cuts from harming our productivity. Our committee has been one of the most active in the House in terms of bills referred to us, hearings we have held, actions we have taken on these bills. Sustaining this level of effort requires a dedicated professional staff.

As Chairman Hastings has noted, under the request he is submitting for 2013, personnel and salary costs will comprise 94.3 percent of the committee's budget. The budget that Chairman Hastings has submitted provides for a freeze at 2013 allocation. In my view, even this request is barely sufficient to enable the committee to do its work. I would therefore strongly urge that the committee approve a budget that would allow for a 5 percent increase in funding. This would help bring the committee's funding level back to a more sustainable level.

What the committee should not do, in my view, is to allow sequestration to further slash the committee's funding. I voted against the sequestration when it came up before the House because I opposed that type of across-the-board cuts that it would require. I understand that the committee is in a difficult position now that no action has been taken by the Congress to eliminate sequestration and replace it with a balanced package of spending reductions and tax reforms.

If the committee approves a committee funding resolution with an 11 percent sequestration reduction, it will adversely affect the ability of both the majority and minority to retain and recruit talented and experienced professional staff. The committee would not be able to maintain the pace of legislative activity to which the chairman and I are committed and which the demands from our colleagues require.

I would note that the chairman has, consistent with the proper practices of our committee, allocated one-third of the personnel and

salary budget to the minority. We have also agreed to continue the practice of the committee to employ the nonpartisan shared staff responsible for certain shared financial management, administrative, and support functions out of the two-thirds share of the majority. We think this arrangement has been fair to both the majority and the minority. With respect to staffing, the majority has also agreed to a two-thirds/one-third split for the committee staff, which results in a proper allocation for the minority.

So I would conclude by reiterating my strong preference that the committee's budget be increased by 5 percent. If that is not possible, I would argue that, at a minimum, the budget should be maintained at the current level in light of the substantial challenges before our committee this Congress. What we cannot and should not do is to allow sequestration to harm the ability of Congress to do the oversight and to pass the legislation that the American people expect us to be working on.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

[The statement of Mr. Markey follows:]

Statement of Representative Edward J. Markey (D-MA)
Ranking Democratic Member, House Committee on Natural Resources
Before the Committee on House Administration
Wednesday, March 6, 2013

Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Brady, and Members of the Committee, I am pleased to join with Chairman Hastings today to ask for your support for the Natural Resources Committee's budget request for the 113th Congress.

While Chairman Hastings and I have some vigorous debates and disagreements in the House Natural Resources Committee, I agree wholeheartedly with his presentation of the budget facts as they relate to the impact of the cuts that our Committee has experienced over the last two years on our ability to carry out the work entrusted to us by the House.

As you know, the Committee itself is one of the oldest committees in the House, having been originally established as the Committee on Public Lands in 1805 following the Louisiana Purchase. A lot of history resides in this committee, from the admission of States and the development of the West, to emergence of the modern conservation movement and what documentary filmmaker Ken Burns has called "America's Greatest Idea" -- our magnificent system of national parks. But the Committee's jurisdiction goes well beyond our national parks, recreation areas, and seashores and encompasses matters as diverse as oil and gas production both onshore and offshore, relations with Native American peoples, relations with the Insular areas of the United States, management of Bureau of Land Management properties and Forest Service lands, regulation of fisheries and oceans, mining, management of precious water resources in huge regions of the West, and operation of the federal power marketing administrations. In order to be able to carry out the duties entrusted to it by the House over all of these diverse and complex matters, the Committee needs a budget that will enable us to do our job.

As Chairman Hastings has noted, our Committee was already forced to absorb a 6.8% cut in funding for 2011, and faced a further reduction of 6.4% last year. These reductions mean that the Committee is now operating with a budget that is 12.7% less than what it received in 2010 – a reduction of more than $1 million in funding.

The Committee and its staff have worked long and hard to prevent these previous cuts from harming our productivity. During the last Congress, the Natural Resources Committee:

- Held 182 oversight or legislative hearings;
- Had 17 full Committee markup sessions in which we reported out 151 bills;
- Brought 81 bills to the floor on the Suspension calendar;
- Brought 37 bills to the floor pursuant to a Rule; and
- Enacted more than 40 public laws.

The record indicates that our Committee has been one of the most active in the House in terms of bills referred to us, hearings we have held, and action we have taken on these bills.

Sustaining this level of effort requires a dedicated professional staff. I appreciate the efforts that Chairman Hastings and our nonpartisan administrative staff have made over the last two years to reduce non-personnel categories of the Committee's budget, but we are nearing the limits of our ability to cut in those areas. As Chairman Hastings has noted, under the request he is submitting for 2013, personnel and salary costs will comprise 94.3% of the Committee's budget.

The budget that Chairman Hastings has submitted provides for a freeze at the 2013 allocation. In my view, even this request is barely sufficient to enable the Committee to do its work. I would therefore strongly urge the Committee to approve a budget that would allow for a 5% increase in funding. This would help bring the Committee's funding back to a more sustainable level.

What the Committee should not do -- in my view -- is to allow sequestration to further slash the Committee's funding. I voted against sequestration when it came before the House because I opposed the type of mindless, across-the-board cuts that it would require. I understand that the Committee is in a difficult position now that no action has been taken by the Congress to eliminate sequestration and replace it with a balanced package of spending reductions and tax reforms. If the Committee approves a Committee funding resolution with an 11% sequestration reduction, it will adversely affect the ability of both the Majority and the Minority to retain and recruit talented and experienced professional staff. The Committee would not be able to maintain the pace of legislative activity to which the Chairman and I are committed, and which the demand from our colleagues requires.

I would note that the Chairman has, consistent with the prior practice of our Committee, allocated 1/3 of the personnel and salary budget to the Minority. We have also agreed to continue the practice of the Committee to employ nonpartisan shared staff responsible for certain shared financial management, administrative, and support functions out of the 2/3rd share for the Majority. We think this arrangement has been fair to both the Majority and the Minority. With respect to staffing, the Majority has also agreed to a 2/3-1/3 split for the Committee staff – which results in 21 staff slots being allocated to the Minority.

So, I would conclude by reiterating my strong preference that the Committee's budget be increased by 5%. If that is not possible, I would argue that at a minimum the budget should be maintained at the current level in light of the substantial challenges before our Committee this Congress. What we cannot, and should not do, is allow sequestration to harm the ability of Congress to do the oversight and pass the legislation that the American people expect us to be working on.

Thank you.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Markey.

And I thank each of you for being here. And now I will ask a few questions and tell you first of all how much I appreciate the work that you do on the committee. You do have a great staff on both sides. And we certainly want to enable you to continue doing the great job that took place in the 112th.

Are there any special circumstances, Mr. Chairman, or you, Mr. Markey, any special circumstances that we need to be aware of when we are establishing these figures?

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, I would just respond by saying, and I pointed that out in my remarks, 94 percent of our budget is salary. That is pretty hard to effect. But there are some issues, you know, supplies that necessarily go with all committees, for that matter. I think that is something that your committee really ought to look at, to see if there can be some—perhaps some consolidation, whether you are talking about subscriptions, whether you are talking about phones, or anything like that. I mean we found, for example, going through our budget, which this is a good exercise, that maybe the cost of phones is extraordinarily high. Now that needs to be looked at. We are certainly going to look at that. But with 94 percent of our budget being salary, it is pretty hard to look at other areas. You get it on the margin at that point.

Mr. HARPER. So you are continuing to look anywhere you can to effect that savings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Yeah. I mean, just to give you an example, I mentioned the 94 percent is salary right now. Just two Congresses ago, the ratio was 90-10. There was 10 percent for travel and everything else. And one of the areas that is affected, we have jurisdiction over all public Federal land. A lot of that is not on the East Coast. I mean, there is some on the East Coast and the West Coast, and we think it is important to have hearings when we can. But we have obviously had to cut our travel budget because that is part of the nonsalary part. But, you know, those are decisions that need to be made. But I think it is advantageous for the American people if we can have hearings in other areas.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Markey, anything you would care to add to the comments of the chairman?

Mr. MARKEY. My father always said when two people agree upon absolutely everything, you don't need one of those people.

So Doc spoke for me.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Markey, and Mr. Chairman.

And now recognize the ranking member, Mr. Brady, for any questions he may have.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just thank you for testifying in front of us. And as I said to every committee here, it is my main concern that it is hard to find qualified people to come in to work for us here at the salary that we pay them when they can make two and three times in the private sector. And then when we do find them at a lower salary, we wind up cutting them. And I know they have dedication, but I think that sometimes school bills and rent and mortgage and little stuff like that matters a little bit. So have you had problems with people that—to attract better people and the people that you have, to be able to keep them?

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you for the question.

I think one of the challenges we face, and Mr. Harper mentioned this when he was introducing the committee, is the diversity we have as far as our jurisdiction. And I talked about that also. It is sometimes very hard to find a staff that say is expert in—has a lot of knowledge in ocean policy to try to figure out what is going on in National Park policy, or western irrigation, or western power. So sometimes it is difficult to find people that overlap, and you have to find people that have expertise in those areas.

But, you know, we do it the best, but because our portfolio is so difficult, I am not sure we have any more problem than other committees. But we do have a wide portfolio, as I mentioned, and that is difficult in itself.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no further questions.

Mr. HARPER. We thank each of you for being here.

Thank you.

The committee now welcomes Chairman Graves and Ranking Member Velázquez of the Committee on Small Business. Would the official reporter please enter a page break into the hearing record to begin a new section.

Mr. HARPER. Established to protect and assist small businesses, the committee has jurisdiction over matters related to small business financial aid, regulatory flexibility, and paperwork reduction. It also has legislative and oversight responsibilities related to the Small Business Administration and its programs.

During the 113th Congress, its priorities are to continue to strive to alleviate the crushing burdens on our Nation's small businesses from excessive health care-related regulations and mandates and to ensure that the Small Business Administration is operating efficiently and effectively in prudently expanding capital and opportunities to our job-creating small businesses.

Chairman Graves and Ranking Member Velázquez, welcome to each of you. And we will recognize each of you now for 5 minutes of testimony.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. SAM GRAVES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. GRAVES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member Brady, for the opportunity to discuss the 2013 budget request of the Small Business Committee.

I am proud of the Small Business Committee's accomplishments in the last Congress. The committee held 80 hearings, 9 field hearings. We engaged in aggressive oversight of the administrations' 20 agencies, and enacted Federal contracting reforms. We reauthorized important research grant programs, passed regulatory reform legislation, and developed some unique communication tools to reach out to small businesses all over America.

We have also been very pleased to serve as a resource to all Members of the House who call on us for assistance with their small business constituents' needs, and we look forward to building on that success.

The committee has done all of this work on a very tight budget, and we should. We understand that Federal spending has to be

curtailed, and we have been willing to prioritize and save. In fact, last year the committee was one of only three committees that were asked for an additional 1 percent above the across-the-board cuts for all the other committees.

The committee provides one-third of its resources to the minority, over which they have full control. And I appreciate the sacrifices and very tough decisions that the ranking member has made to ensure that the committee lives within its means, while meeting its responsibilities.

Today we are talking about the additional cuts in 2013 and how various budget scenarios might affect the committee's operations. And like most committees, the vast majority of our funding is devoted to personnel. Currently, we have 28 staff doing the work to keep the committee running and meeting our oversight and legislative responsibilities. And frankly, we could use more staff. But knowing that more budget cuts are likely, the majority made decisions not to hire and to combine some staff duties so that our payroll would be sustainable in 2013. We hope that will be the case.

But honestly, an 11 percent cut would require us to make some very difficult personnel decisions. The committee does not have a significant amount of non-salary spending to look to for savings. And these expenditures give us the tools to do our work like communications, reference materials, supplies, equipment. And there really is not a whole lot of fat to cut if we want to do effective oversight and run an efficient organization.

If the committee's budget level is funded or set at 105 percent of what was actually spent in 2012, the outlook improves. And we still may not be able to hire the additional staff that we need, but we would be able to maintain the status quo. The budgets that the committee has submitted under these scenarios reflect this reality. And our budget submissions show relatively flat or slightly reduced spending in non-personnel budget categories. The personnel budget is adjusted for whichever scenario is going to occur.

And I appreciate that the House Administration Committee has a tough job to do in administering yet another round of budget cuts to the committees. We will do our best to work with whatever resources are provided. And we hope that the members will consider that our committee is already doing more with less, and it has an important role to fulfill as it advocates for the Nation's best job creators.

Thank you for the committee's time.

[The statement of Mr. Graves follows:]

SAM GRAVES, MISSOURI
CHAIRMAN

NYDIA M. VELAZQUEZ, NEW YORK
RANKING MEMBER

Congress of the United States
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Small Business
2361 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6315

Statement of
The Honorable Sam Graves (MO-6)
Chairman
Committee on Small Business
Hearing on Committee Funding
House Administration Committee, Washington DC
March 6, 2013

Thank you, Chairwoman Miller and Ranking Member Brady, for the opportunity to discuss the 2013 budget request of the Committee on Small Business.

I am proud of the Small Business Committee's accomplishments in the last Congress. The Committee held 80 hearings, including 9 field hearings; engaged in aggressive oversight of the Administration across 20 agencies; enacted Federal contracting reforms; reauthorized important research grant programs; and developed unique communications tools to reach out to small businesses across America. We also have been pleased to serve as a resource to *all* Members of the House who call on us for assistance with their small business constituents' needs.

The Committee has done all of this work on a tight budget, as we should. We understand that Federal spending must be curtailed, and we have been willing to prioritize and save. In fact, last year, the Committee was one of three asked to take an additional one percent reduction in the across-the-board cut that applied to other House committees.

The Committee provides one-third of its resources to the minority, over which they have full control. I appreciate the sacrifices and tough decisions the Ranking Member has made to ensure the Committee lives within its means while meeting our responsibilities.

Today, we are here to talk about additional cuts in 2013 and how various budget scenarios might affect Committee operations. Like most committees, the vast majority of our funding is devoted to personnel – currently we have 28 staff doing the work to keep the Committee running and meeting our oversight and legislative responsibilities. Frankly, we could use a few more staff, but knowing that more budget cuts were likely, the majority made decisions not to hire and to combine staff duties, so that our payroll would be sustainable in 2013. We hope that will be the case, but honestly, an 11 percent cut would require us to make some difficult personnel decisions.

The Committee does not have a significant amount of non-salary spending to look to for savings. These expenditures give us the tools to do our work – communications, reference materials, supplies, equipment – there is really not much fat to cut if we want to do effective oversight and run an efficient organization.

If the Committee's budget is level-funded or set at 105 percent of what was actually spent in 2012 the outlook improves. We still may not be able to hire all the additional staff we need, but we would be able to maintain the status quo.

The budgets that the Committee has submitted under these scenarios reflect this reality. Our budget submissions show relatively flat or slightly reduced spending in non-personnel budget categories. The personnel budget is adjusted for whichever scenario occurs.

I appreciate that the House Administration Committee has a tough job to do in administering yet another round of budget cuts to committees. We will do our best work with whatever resources are provided, but we hope the Members will consider that our Committee is already doing more with less and has an important role to fulfill as advocates for our nation's best job creators.

I thank the Committee members for their time, and I'd be pleased to take any questions.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I now recognize Ranking Member Velázquez.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Thank you, Chairman Harper, Ranking Member Brady. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the budget submission for the Small Business Committee in the 113th Congress.

I think it goes without saying the key role small businesses play in our economy. During tough times, small firms are often looked upon to help lift us back toward prosperity. Our job on the committee is not solely to investigate and examine any matter affecting small businesses but also serve as the voice of small firms and entrepreneurs in Congress.

The Committee on Small Business covers a number of issues: Health care, taxes, energy, capital access, contracting, technology, agriculture, trade, not to mention jurisdiction over the Small Business Administration. Such an extensive portfolio requires staff with expertise in the various issue areas. As many committees have indicated, it is difficult to retain highly skilled staff with a budget that continues to dwindle. We have made adjustments along the way, but deeper and deeper cuts will undoubtedly take a toll.

While the funds are reduced, the workload only continues to increase. The reality is that the minority was able to manage with last year's budget strictly due to the fact that we were understaffed. Although our operational expenses are kept to a strict minimum, our funding does not allow us to fill all vacant slots. For example, we actually need a regulations counsel as well as an economist. We have not yet filled those positions.

Now with sequestration in effect, any and all future planning as far as staffing are concerned have been put on hold until we know what the outcome will be. Chairman Graves and I, along with all our committee members, continue to work in a bipartisan manner to fulfill our jurisdiction of responsibilities. We understand these spending cuts are inevitable, but we ask that you are gentle when reviewing our numbers. The better staffed and equipped our committee is, the better prepared we are to fulfill our jurisdictional responsibility. Thank you, and I appreciate your time, and will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you very much.

And we know this is a difficult time. We have already been through a round of reductions in the 112th. And so I would ask each of you, do you have any unique challenges to your workload that you will have in this Congress versus the 112th?

Mr. GRAVES. Well, the biggest thing is obviously going to be, you know, trying to continue those resources, provide those resources to committee members that obviously they need when they are doing, you know, serving their constituencies, whether it is, you know, through doing a small business symposium or a contracting event where, you know, they are trying to show small businesses the opportunities within the Federal Government on contracting. You know, that gets tougher when the budget is cut. And then also just trying to do more with less. And again, that is where we are. I think we are authorized up to 47 employees, but we have 28.

Mr. HARPER. Well, I want to say thanks for the effort you are making.

And this is obviously difficult for everyone to try to do.

But I am going to now recognize Ranking Member Brady to see if he has any questions.

Mr. BRADY. Again, my comment is whether or not you can attract the quality people to do your job, or whether you can keep them ones you have with the institutional knowledge. They may not want to stay. They are getting paid less probably than the private sector. Now you are asking them to take another cut. And I wonder how that may affect the ability for you to perform in your committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. It is very difficult to be able to hire experts, qualified, talented, committed staff. And not only that, but just for these staff to feel that they will be remunerated and that they will stay on board. It is very easy to train staff that will be willing to leave and go into the private sector. I am pleased, don't forget, this is the smallest budget of any committee. And given the state of the economy and how fragile the economy still is, we get so many calls from Members, individual Members, not only that serve on the committee but across the board, asking us to help them navigate some of the obstacles that small businesses are facing when they are trying to access capital through traditional lenders or to help put together workshops in their districts.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you. And thank you for appearing for all of us.

And that is all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you very much for taking the time to come and see us. Thank you.

The committee now welcomes Chairman Conaway and Ranking Member Sánchez of the Committee on Ethics. Would the official reporter please enter a page break into the hearing record to begin a new section?

Mr. HARPER. We welcome both of you here. In the interest of time, I had some information here to read about what your committee does and the importance of it, but I have firsthand knowledge of how important the committee is. And we welcome both of you here today. And we are going to attempt to get through before they call for votes here.

And we appreciate very much you being here, Chairman Conaway, Ranking Member Sánchez. And you each have 5 minutes to testify before the committee.

And I now recognize Chairman Conaway.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. MIKE CONAWAY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. CONAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Harper.

Let the record reflect that your exposure to the Ethics Committee is as a member of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. HARPER. Yeah, let's clear that up, please.

Mr. CONAWAY. In the interest of time, I am going to dispense with reading my testimony to you, if I could get unanimous consent to enter it in the record.

Mr. HARPER. Without objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. When I started as chair this time, the team mission is to get our work done as quickly and expeditiously as possible. That requires some resources to make that happen. One of the complaints about the House Ethics Committee is that our investigations and our processes take too long and drag out. And some of that is built into the system, but the idea is to move things along quickly. Members are far better off with an answer than with the unknown. So both on the customer service side of our shop, advice and education side, getting those answers out quickly as well, but on the adjudicatory phases, making that happen quickly is high on our list as well.

We are currently at 24 employees. We are rated up to 29. We don't have the resources to go to 29 at this point. We are in an unusual circumstance, as you are well aware, coming off of a particular case the last 2 years that provided additional resources to the committee. And we would argue to keep some of those, given the increase in workload that the STOCK Act is in the process of having, as well as continuing to do the job in as expeditious a manner as we can because of the impact that our work has on Members' reputations as well as their ability to do their job as well.

So, with those brief statements, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the ranking member and be ready for your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Conaway follows:]

Chairman K. Michael Conaway

Committee on Ethics

Testimony before the Committee on House Administration

March 6, 2013

Good afternoon Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Brady, and members of the Committee. Thank you for inviting Ranking Member Sánchez and me to share our assessment of where the Committee stands, and where it can go depending on the difficult determinations your Committee is making. While we cannot get into the details of our work, most of which is confidential by House Rule, we'll be as frank as we can.

While I'm the new Chairman, this is my fifth year serving on the Committee. I've lived through tough times and tougher times on this Committee, participating in the difficult tasks of our investigative subcommittees. I deeply appreciate the seriousness that my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, bring to our responsibilities. Our work is vital, even if service on the Ethics Committee is not always a cherished assignment.

I also bring to this job my experience as a CPA and as the former Chairman of Texas' audit board, the Texas State Board of Public Accountancy. As the Chair of TSBPA, I oversaw a review of some of the most serious financial mismanagement and accounting misconduct the country has seen.

The Committee's work and financial needs are commonly divided into three main functions. These are advice and education, financial disclosure review, and investigation and adjudication. Advice and education, and financial disclosure review are primarily customer service efforts. Members and staff seek out the committee staffs' council and guidance to avoid running afoul of the rules. Our staff works every day to provide our customers with accurate and consistent answers in a timely manner. Our investigation and adjudication work is qualitatively different. In addition to accuracy and promptness, we strive for integrity, discretion, fairness in process, and a complete understanding of the facts.

I am proud of our staff. I believe that they have some of the most difficult jobs on Capitol Hill and they manage the many pressures of their positions with the utmost professionalism. They are dedicated public servants who are zealously nonpartisan. They work tirelessly to protect Members and staff from making missteps and, in those rare occasions when an ethical question does arise, they work methodically to determine the facts and to protect the rights of the individual under investigation the reputation of this cherished institution.

I began my tenure as chairman demanding that all of the offices of the committee consider timeliness as a top priority in all of their work. I know that when the Committee is asked for advice, or approval, or when they tell a Member or an employee that their conduct has come under review, there is a heavy burden weighing on those Members or staff. Our staff is committed to keeping those burdens in mind.

The other side of that coin, however, is that we also have to act responsibly and carefully. It helps no one if we toss out hasty and inconsistent advice, or when we miss critical questions or red flags when we prescreen a financial disclosure statement. And finally, whether we clear somebody of false allegations, or whether we recommend sanctions to the House, if we haven't done a complete, thorough and detailed analysis of the evidence that either supports or contradicts an allegation, then we are doing a disservice to the integrity of the House and failing in our responsibility to the American people.

As I learned in my time overseeing accounting misconduct in Texas, credible, responsible, and fair counseling and investigations are labor intensive. It is clear that we have an increasing caseload in all three functions, as the Ranking Member will describe in her comments. We are also seeing more and more lawyering in our investigative matters, which is, of course, a respondent's right, but it also increases the length of the investigative process, and places additional burdens on our staff. Our skilled and committed professional staff is at the edge of what they can accomplish at current levels.

Already, the Committee is taking years to resolve investigations, which should be concluded in a much shorter time. Lengthy delays are a disservice to the Members and staff under investigation and harm the integrity of the committee's adjudicatory process. Providing timely responses to inquiries and expedient resolutions to investigations will continue to be a challenge over the next year without additional staff attorneys.

Fortunately, the Committee's FY2012 budget is sufficient to meet these needs. Because of the careful planning that your Committee helped us with over the past two years, we will have the resources that we need, without any further budget increases. Ranking Member Sánchez and I, along with our staff, have developed a plan that assumes level funding in FY13 and factors in potential sequestration cuts, but still allows the Committee to finally move past the backlog of cases that have accumulated.

I believe that the hard work of the past two years has laid the foundation for an Ethics Committee that can correct the problems of the past and is prepared to meet the new challenges facing us. With the continued support of the members of this Committee, the Ethics Committee's productivity and promptness will be dramatically improved.

Thank you for this time, and I look forward to your questions.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And Ranking Member Sánchez, you are now recognized.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Thank you so much. And in the interests of time, I would also ask unanimous consent to just have my formal statement included in the record.

Mr. HARPER. Without objection.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Great. In the interest of time, I just want to touch on three very important things that impact the work of the Ethics Committee. We are a unique committee in that we have a nonpartisan professional staff, and they have a tremendous workload to do the work that we require of them and that gives confidence to the public in the work that we do up here on the Hill.

In 2007, private travel was mandated to be reviewed by the Ethics Committee. And that has increased the workload of the committee tremendously. We are coming up almost on the 10,000th request for private travel. And that is an involved process of getting information from the trip sponsors. It requires a lot of time. And that has increased the staff hours required in order to review each of those requests for private travel.

In 2008, the Office of Congressional Ethics, the OCE, was created. They are able to refer matters to the Ethics Committee. And that has also increased the workload of the staff themselves. While the majority of work that the committee staff does is still self-initiated by the committee, those OCE referrals do add to their casework. And staffing authority was increased in accordance with the creation of the OCE, but we have never been fully staffed up since then. Although we operate with a highly trained staff, we are not at our maximum capacity in terms of the staff that we could hire. The one thing that is keeping us from doing that, of course, is the budget.

And then lastly, with the passage of the STOCK Act, we now are requiring periodic transaction reports of transactions of stock or assets. And that occurs several times throughout the year. Each one of those transactions has to be reviewed and certified by committee staff. So that will also significantly increase the caseload.

So we are basically here—and I am in agreement with everything the chairman said—we are basically here to say that given the challenges that face the Ethics Committee, further reductions in our budget would mean longer wait times for Members and others to get the answers that they need and deserve.

So I will leave that to your consideration. I know you have a tough job to do. But we also are seeking to do the work the Ethics Committee needs to do under very challenging circumstances.

And with that, I will yield back the balance of my time.

[The statement of Ms. Sánchez follows:]

Testimony before the Committee on House Administration
Committee on Ethics
Remarks by Ranking Member Linda T. Sánchez
March 6, 2013

Good afternoon Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Brady, and members of the Committee. Thank you for the chance to talk about the work of the Ethics Committee and its budget needs.

As the Chairman indicated, we both want to continue to find ways to improve the Committee's response times to Members and staff. Whether someone is seeking advice or is the subject of an investigation, we recognize that these are all important matters.

I want to thank the Chairman for his commitment – which I share. Our staff shares this commitment, too.

I would like to discuss how our need for increased staff is based, not only, on our own desire to be more efficient, but also on several significant developments that affect the Committee's work.

We believe that we will need to increase our staff to be able to meet new requirements in the manner the House and the public expect and deserve.

One of these evolving challenges is privately sponsored travel. In 2007, the House mandated that the Committee review and approve all requests for privately sponsored travel. Since then, the requests have increased significantly. The reviews by our staff have also grown more comprehensive and thorough.

In the last Congress, the Committee received more than 3,500 requests to accept privately sponsored travel. Just two months into this Congress, we have received more than 430 requests. Assuming typical patterns continue, this week, the Committee will break the 10,000 mark for private travel requests since the current private travel rules took effect in 2007.

Each travel request involves a thorough review and approval process. In the past, Members and staff have faced significant consequences if private travel sponsors gave false and misleading information, or if a trip did not comply with House Rules. Verifying the information provided by the travelers and sponsors – as well as other public information – so the Committee can approve a proposed trip takes an extraordinary amount of time.

In 2008, the House created the Office of Congressional Ethics. Although the Committee continues to begin most investigative matters at its own initiative, OCE has contributed to an increase in the Committee's investigative work.

Our staffing authorization was increased accordingly to handle our increased workload. However, as the Chairman noted, we have not yet been able to fill all of these positions.

More recently, a new development created even more demands on our staff. Last year, the STOCK Act created a new financial reporting requirement for Members and senior staff. In addition to filing reports of certain transactions on an annual basis, filers must now file Periodic Transaction Reports throughout the year.

The Committee is required by law to certify compliance with the filing requirements for every report filed. So, we must check all the information we have in order to determine if amendments to any report are needed. For example, each time someone reports a sale of an asset on a PTR, our staff has to check that filer's previously filed PTRs and annual statements, until we can identify the previous ownership of that asset. As more reports are filed, more documents must be checked for each filer.

For context, in each of the last three Congresses the Committee reviewed more than 6,000 financial disclosure statements and amendments. Since the STOCK Act took effect less than one year ago, the Committee has received more than 850 PTRs reporting more than 9,000 transactions. Some PTRs list dozens of transactions.

From our brief experience, it is clear that without increased staffing, there will come a time when we simply will not be able to review and certify every transaction on every PTR.

These three major developments, each of which was mandated by the House, have contributed to a dramatic increase in the Committee's workload. Our funding level and our staff authorization have grown since 2007, and we are grateful for that. However, it is clear that we have not yet reached the staff level necessary to meet these obligations and provide the prompt and consistent service that the House and the public have a right to expect.

We appreciate the tough task your committee has before it. Whatever budget is allocated to the Ethics Committee, the Chairman and I can assure you the Members and staff of the Committee will continue to meet its responsibilities to the House. However, in light of the significant – and growing – obligations the Committee has under House rules and federal law, renewing the amount allocated to the Ethics Committee last year would greatly help the Committee meet its obligations.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear here today. We look forward to your questions.

###

Mr. HARPER. Thank you so much.

And we do appreciate what the Ethics Committee does. And while we may not be fully staffed, you have an excellent staff that is very dedicated and hardworking, and much appreciated for a lot of the work that the average Member may never pay any attention to or look at what has to be done in such great detail and to make sure that every "i" is dotted and every "t" is crossed, and sometimes in triplicate to make sure that that gets done.

So we are in a difficult budget era, and we understand that, but I would ask each of you, do you have any unique challenges—and I know you are not at liberty to discuss details—but do you have any unique challenges that you see facing you in the 113th Congress that did not exist in the 112th Congress that we need to be aware of just in generalities?

Mr. CONAWAY. Yeah, as the ranking member mentioned, we have got these periodic transaction reports. Those are coming in, they are required within 30 days of when the filer becomes aware of a transaction but no later than 45 days after a transaction of notice. We will have those throughout the year. Then the annual financial statements themselves will include very similar information and there will be numerous inquiries, I suspect, from the press and others as to why there may be differences, clerical and others. So we anticipate that that will only grow.

We are also challenged with working with some Members as to how they actually deal with the STOCK Act. And that is requiring additional resources.

I want to echo your comments earlier about our team. We have a terrific staff. And one of the reasons why we have been able to do the work that has been done so far, and I think, quite frankly, improve over what previous years have done, is because of the hard work and dedication of the team that is in place. They are terrific. But the STOCK Act will have additional ramifications that we really can't tell. Electronic filing of that implementation of that, the education piece of it that will have to go with the electronic filing piece for these PDRs, as well as for financial disclosures will increase our workload as well. And because it is a complaint-driven system, you never know when a spat of complaints will come in. We don't anticipate those right now, but we are subject to Members running afoul of the rules.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Anything you would like to add to that?

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. No. I think the chairman summed it up quite adequately. The STOCK Act will create a deluge of additional work. And that is something that we will try to keep pace with as best we can. But it will be very challenging if we don't have additional staff to help that.

Mr. HARPER. I will now recognize Ranking Member Brady for any questions he may have.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you for your testimony and appearing today. I dare not ask this committee any questions.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you for your time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Let me make one off. I have written a report to you, we talked about areas of potential savings. We use Westlaw and LexisNexis on our committee. There may be other committees

who have subscriptions to that one as well. And an institution-wide subscription might be cheaper rather than each individual committee doing it. That way we keep the resources that we need to have it, but the House would spend less money doing it.

Mr. HARPER. Certainly Judiciary comes to mind and other committees.

Mr. CONAWAY. Judiciary. I suspect that many of the lawyers on all of the committees somehow have access to it. And if there is a way we can squeeze a little out of those guys, those guys being Nexis and Westlaw, then it might help the overall efforts.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for being here.

The committee now welcomes Chairman McKeon and Ranking Member Smith of the Committee on Armed Services. Would the official reporter please enter a page break into the hearing record to begin a new section?

Mr. HARPER. In the interest of time, and knowing that votes could be coming shortly, rather than read the entire script that I have here, I want to say we commend you on the great work that the committee does. We have some difficult time that we have upon us because of budget restraints.

But at this time, I will now recognize Chairman McKeon for 5 minutes for any remarks he would care to make.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, Chairman Harper, Ranking Member Brady, distinguished members of the committee.

Mr. BRADY. You are looking at them.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you for the opportunity once again to testify on the resource requirements of the Armed Services Committee and the work that drives those requirements. There was a thing here that told me what to do, and I covered it up.

I am grateful to be joined here today by my partner, Ranking Member Adam Smith. Adam's presence here today is more than symbolic. I am proud to say that the Armed Services Committee is truly a bipartisan committee. For more than a half century, our committee has fulfilled the House constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense. We do that each year by pulling our parties together to craft an annual defense authorization bill (NDAA). Each year, Adam and I have worked to stop politics at the water's edge and build a sound military and national security policy based on bipartisan consensus, sending a message to every man and woman in uniform that their country is behind them.

This week, we started the first series of hearings in preparation for the 52nd annual NDAA. We will do it in the toughest partisan environment either of us has ever known. Every year, the naysayers ask if this is the cycle when we won't get a bill done, and every year, we beat the odds. Last year, we passed our bill with only hours to spare.

The partisan environment does not give me pause. The enhanced oversight burden that we face does not deter me. If there is one thing that I worry will stop us from getting our work done or cause

us to produce a substandard product, it is a resource deficit that we face in our committee.

The Armed Services Committee (HASC) is the largest committee in the House, overseeing the largest Federal department. Yet we are also a no-frills, bang-for-your-buck organization. The committee ranks 10th on overall committee funding. We have the lowest staff-to-Member ratio of any committee, at 1 to 1.15.

Traditionally, we return less than 1 percent of our allocated funds, which I will elaborate on later on in my testimony. I appreciate that last year the HASC resources were not cut as deeply as they might have been. However, that cut did have an impact. Though we are authorized 71 staff slots, we could only sustain 67 personnel on staff in the 112th Congress. In order to sustain this reduced staff, we were forced to cancel important resources like subscriptions—by the way, that sounds kind of, you know, a subscription? But we have to be able to respond immediately when they testify on the Senate side, and then come over to our side. This gives us the ability to get these things online and have our questions ready the next day. Deferred maintenance, replacement of equipment we have had to defer.

Ninety-six percent the of the committee's budget is spent on staff salaries. That is the case in large part because we rely on highly specialized staff to carry out our mission. Employees must be able to hold top level security clearances as a condition of employment. They must also be not just proficient but experts in a variety of national security policies, weapons platforms, and strategically vital regions. Most importantly, Adam and I have been able to rely on them to do the Herculean behind-the-scenes work that it takes to get a bill like the NDAA passed.

Like many Americans, HASC staff has gone without cost-of-living adjustments for 2 years. At the proposed 11 percent cut, the committee will only be able to support 61 staff, and even then, we may need to implement a furlough system. We will limp by on old equipment and rely on detailees from other agencies to carry out vital oversight work. We will not be able to fill critical vacancies in our Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee or the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

I am concerned that a deep cut to the committee's budget would be pennywise but pound foolish. Given the size and scope of the Department of Defense (DOD) budget and the opportunities that we have to find other savings, it would behoove us to be able to have a more complete staff that could help us delve into these things. Proposed cuts would cripple committee functions at an important time.

The defense bill we have already begun work on for fiscal year 2014 will be one of the most important our committee has ever passed. This is a pivotal time for the Department of Defense. Their resources are on the decline, while threats around the world are on the rise. As I said, we have already started the hearing process. We have already heard from several of our combatant commanders, and things are getting worse, not better.

The committee will have a decisive role to play in a number of key areas. We will help determine how our forces withdraw from Afghanistan without giving up the gains we have made over the

course of a decade. We will help chart the military's course in dealing with the emerging cyber threat. We will ensure that missions against the emerging al Qaeda threat in North Africa are properly resourced. Most importantly, we will embark on a substantial reform project.

Adam and I often disagree on the appropriate amount to spend on the military, but we do agree on this: As it stands today, our military strategy, the defense budget, the DOD policy, and the threats around the world are mismatched. If we do not reform the Pentagon, we will find ourselves in a readiness crisis with a hollow force.

In the absence of a fiscal year 2014 defense authorization bill, the Pentagon and the White House will begin making a series of irreversible and shortsighted decisions. They will be forced to. These decisions are aimed at resolving short-term budget problems at the expense of long-term strategic challenges.

Many of us have already experienced the first taste of those choices when the Air Guard attempted to divest itself of critical equipment last year. It was the House Armed Services Committee that uncovered the flaws in the Air Force's logic, and it was the HASC, through the NDAA, that protected those assets with a better solution.

Thank you for listening to me.

[The statement of Mr. McKeon follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON
CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

Chairman Miller, Mr. Brady, distinguished member of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity once again to testify on the resource requirements of the Armed Services Committee and the work that drives those requirements. I am grateful to be joined here today by my partner and ranking member, Adam Smith.

Adam's presence here today is more than symbolic. I am proud to say that the Armed Services Committee is a truly bi-partisan committee. For more than a half-century our committee has fulfilled the House's Constitutional responsibility to "provide for the common defense."

We do that each year by pulling our parties together to craft an annual defense authorization bill. Each year Adam and I have worked to stop politics at the water's edge and build a sound military and national security policy based on bi-partisan consensus; sending a message to every man and women in uniform that their country is behind them.

This week, we will hold the first series of hearings in preparation for the 52nd annual NDAA. We will do it in the toughest partisan environment either of us has ever known. Every year naysayers ask if this is the cycle when we won't get a bill done and every year we beat the odds. Last year, we passed our bill with only hours to spare.

The partisan environment does not give me pause. The enhanced oversight burden we face does not deter me. If there is one thing that I worry will stop us from getting our work done, or cause us to produce a substandard product; it is a resource deficit in the committee.

Who we are and what we do

The Armed Services Committee is the largest committee in the House, overseeing the largest federal department. Yet, we are also a "no frills," "bang for your buck" organization. The Committee ranks 10th on overall committee funding. We have the lowest staff to member ratio of any committee at 1:1.15. Traditionally, we return less than 1% of our allocated funds.

I appreciate that last year, HASC resources were not cut as deeply as they might have been. However, the cut did have an impact. Though we are authorized 71 staff slots, we could only sustain 67 personnel on staff in the 112th Congress. In order to

sustain this reduced staff we were forced to cancel important resources like subscriptions and deferred maintenance and replacement of equipment.

96% of the Committee budget is spent on staff salaries. That is the case, in large part, because we rely on highly specialized staff to carry out our mission. Employees must be able to hold top level security clearances as a condition of employment. They must also be not just proficient, but experts in a variety of national security policies, weapons platforms, and strategically vital regions. Most importantly Adam and I have to be able to rely on them to do the herculean behind the scenes work that it takes to get a bill like the NDAA passed. Like many Americans, HASC staff has gone without cost of living adjustments for two years.

At the proposed 11% cut, the committee will only be able to support 61 staff and even then we may need to implement a furlough system. We will limp by on old equipment and rely on detailees from other agencies to carry out vital oversight work. We will not be able to fill critical vacancies in our Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee or the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

This would cripple committee functions at an important time. The Defense Bill we have already begun work on for FY14 will be one of the most important our committee has ever passed. This is a pivotal time for the Department of Defense, their resources are on the decline while threats around the world are on the rise.

The Committee will have a decisive role to play in a number of key areas. We will help determine how our forces withdraw from Afghanistan without giving up the gains we have made over the course of a decade. We will help chart the military's course in dealing with the emerging cyber threat, while also managing our status as a likely target of cyber attack.

We will ensure that missions against the emerging al Qaeda threat in North Africa are properly resourced. As military resources decline, the HASC will also ensure that DoD does not divest itself of critical equipment – like Guard and Reserve platforms- in a manner inconsistent with domestic requirements.

Most importantly, we will embark on a substantial reform project. Adam and I often disagree on the appropriate amount to spend on the military. But we do agree on this: As it stands today our military strategy, the defense budget, DoD policy, and the threats around the world are mismatched. If we do not reform the Pentagon, we will find ourselves in a readiness crisis with a hollow force.

In the absence of an FY14 Defense Authorization Bill, The Pentagon and the White House will begin making a series of irreversible and short-sighted decisions. These decisions are aimed at resolving short-term budget problems at the expense of long-term strategic challenges. Many of you have already experienced the first taste of those choices when the Air Guard attempted to divest itself of critical equipment last year. It was the House Armed Services Committee that uncovered the flaws in the

Air Force's logic and it was the HASC, through the NDAA, that protected those assets with a better solution.

I fully expect that sequestration will force the Army to make the same tough choices for the National Guard this year. Without a FY14 Defense Bill, Congress will have a difficult time influencing those choices. Without a fully staffed and resourced and resourced committee, passing an adequate FY14 NDAA is put at risk.

Thank you again Chairman Miller, for your time and the opportunity to testify. I am happy to answer your questions after Mr. Smith's testimony.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I now recognize Ranking Member Smith.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. ADAM SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Brady.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

I concur with everything that Buck said. I have a statement for the record, which I will submit. We do work in a very bipartisan way to produce a product. I always like to say, we are one of the most bipartisan committees in Congress. And I think our National Defense Authorizing Act proves that. We come together every year to pass a substantial piece of legislation.

I only want to highlight a couple of budget facts about our committee. First of all, we have the lowest ratio—I may get this mixed up—we have the fewest staff per Members of any committee in Congress, the largest committee in terms of the number of Members. And also our budget, and one of the key decisions you are going to have to make as you make these cuts, is whether or not you cut the amount of the overall budget or the amount that the committees actually spend. I understand that there are many committees that have budgets that exceed what they spend on a year in and year out basis. So if you do an across-the-board cut, they will have plenty of room to work. We don't have that room because we spend right up to our budget. Because of the size of the committee, because of the limited number of staff—I am not seeing the percentage here—but I think it is somewhere over 90 percent of our budget is staff, are the people who actually write our bill every year. If we face an 11 percent cut, it will make it very difficult for us to produce the same quality product that we used to because it will cut the people who are responsible for producing that product. We don't have wiggle room on technology or stationery or travel. We just don't have much budget. It is staff dependent. And if you take this 11 percent across-the-board approach, I think that would be very, very unfair. We are hoping to get, you know, a smaller number, reflective on what is actually spent so we can maintain the staff necessary to do our job, frankly.

And as Mr. McKeon indicated, you know, 51 straight years, we have passed a bill. Last year, you could make an argument that the defense authorizing committees were the only committees that passed substantive legislation, given that the Appropriations Committee didn't even get there. So it is important work, and we need staff to do it.

We don't have much wiggle room budgetwise. I hope you will take that into account when you go to make these numbers work. I understand you have a very difficult job. I yield back.

[The statement of Mr. Smith of Washington follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ADAM SMITH
RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

March 6, 2013

Madame Chairman, Mr. Brady, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity once again to testify on the funding needs of the Committee on Armed Services. As always, I am pleased to do so with my Chairman and friend, Buck McKeon.

As Buck mentioned, we appear before you as a functioning bipartisan committee, faithfully passing a defense authorization bill for 51 consecutive years. Each year the task grows more difficult as threats to our nation continue to evolve and the impact of our fiscal situation undermine national security. There is no doubt that this year will be challenging. Implementation of across the board spending cuts under the BCA and now sequestration are already forcing tough decisions regarding operations and maintenance, personnel, and future weapon systems acquisitions. The committee will need to oversee the impacts of these decisions throughout this fiscal year and into the future. Now, more than ever, it is imperative that the Armed Services Committee maintain its capacity to adequately conduct oversight of the Department of Defense to ensure that our nation's defense is assured.

I am pleased to report to you once again that the committee continues to maintain a bipartisan staff with fifteen of the total seventy-one staffing positions allocated to the minority. With emphasis on subject expertise rather than politics, the HASC staff, writ large, is second to none and it is often called on to support Members

on both sides of the aisle. The allocation of minority slots is unchanged following the 9.5% budget reduction in the 112th Congress. I have maintained one vacancy to be able to afford those fourteen staffers. My current staff includes twelve professional staff who oversee the complex multi-billion dollar defense budget and who support the Members on the committee, one administrative professional and one communications professional who is also responsible for a portion of the defense portfolio.

I understand that there is a proposed 11% reduction in funding for 2013 that may be applied to the 113th committee budget. If this reduction is approved, the $811,224 decrease would take us to the 2006 committee funding level. This reduction would be difficult to absorb and I fear it would force yet another reduction in a committee staff where the ratio of members to staff is nearly one-to-one. Any further reduction to the already streamlined staffing structure would make it much more difficult to prepare the annual National Defense Authorization Act or to conduct oversight of DOD's 525 billion dollar defense base budget. It would also inhibit the continued oversight of the ongoing war in Afghanistan and of DOD operations around the world. I understand and strongly support the need for fiscal responsibility, but I believe that reducing HASC committee staff will impair the Congress' ability to conduct necessary oversight.

The Chairman and I are committed to finding efficiencies and savings in the committee's operating budget. Over the past year the majority has lost and is yet to replace three of the committee's most senior staffers who had a combined professional tenure of nearly 65 years. That kind of expertise is difficult to replace and their loss is felt by both the majority and minority. Additionally, the majority has not backfilled recently vacated staff assistant positions, essentially utilizing one staff assistant for

three or more subcommittees. This must be corrected before we start the FY14 NDAA bill process or we will have great difficulty meeting the administrative needs of those subcommittees. To save more money, the committee has suspended publication subscriptions and implemented several efficiencies and cost-saving IT processes. All this has helped us meet our budget targets, but further cuts will likely damage committee operations and put in jeopardy its mission of providing effective legislative oversight over the Department of Defense.

I am proud to serve on the Armed Services Committee with my friend the Chairman as we execute our duty to provide for our men and women in uniform and for the defense of the nation. We are both committed to ensuring responsible defense spending in support of national security. I hope your committee will carefully weigh any committee budget recommendations before you and support us as we continue that vital mission.

Thank You, Madame Chairman.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you so much. I appreciate each of you giving us some insight into the difficulties that you face.

And what I would ask is, as we are looking at the 113th Congress, are there any unique challenges that you see you face as a committee that you didn't face in the 112th that we need to be aware of?

Mr. MCKEON. Sequestration, yes. That has been a huge cut to the Defense Department. And I alluded to that in my statement. The fact that they are having to make decisions—now, if we pass that Continuing Resolution (CR) today and the defense appropriations bill, that will help get through this year. But we have already started our budget process for this next year. And I guarantee you the Chiefs are going to need guidance from us and from our committee and from the Members of Congress in final decisions that they make.

And as I also pointed out, we need very top quality staff. Most of our staff could make more if they left our committee and went somewhere else. Because of the training, most of them have served in the military and retired at high ranks. But that is required for the job they have to do. We have former pilots that oversee the planes and the services and the pilots that fly them. So I think this year, going from the defense budgets that we have had for the last 10 years to what we will be dealing with going forward, it is crucial that we not be under-resourced at this time.

Mr. HARPER. And Ranking Member Smith, do you see any unique challenges that you see as far as your workload is concerned for the 113th Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I would just clarify the chairman said sequestration. He doesn't mean the sequestration that we are dealing with here; he means the sequestration that is so going to disproportionately hit the Department of Defense as they have to scramble to figure out what to do under that and the legislative authority that we are going to need to help them.

Another responsibility of our committee is to examine reprogramming requests that come from the Department of Defense. There are going to be a lot of reprogramming requests that are going to be very, very important. And I think that would enhance the workload significantly.

Mr. HARPER. I will now recognize Ranking Member Brady for any questions he may have.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the most fortunate people in this Congress to be able to serve on two committees, this committee, which is totally nonpartisan, and Armed Services Committee, which I am proud to serve on for the last 14 years, again shows its bipartisanship. I am lucky to say I have two chairmen. They don't look at each other as ranking or chairman; they look at each other as equals, and they conduct themselves as such in the committee, and which we do appreciate it, because I think they both realize that we are also helping out our men and women that are in harm's way and were in harm's way, and they keep their eye on the ball.

The only I guess comment or question I would have is knowing that you can't hire more people—it is tough to do that—it is also

tough to hire people with the quality and the skill set and the institutional knowledge that they would need to be able to perform on Armed Services Committee. That is one thing. But the other thing I am really concerned about is keeping the people that we have. We have an excellent staff. I work with them all day long all the time we are there, and they do a great job. And it is hard to have them continue what they are doing when they get hired at a low rate, and because of their dedication, as the chairman stated, and then we have to cut them down. And hopefully, we can keep them with the institutional knowledge and the skill sets that they have. Now we are going to ask them to take a pay cut. So I am trying to do my best, and I know this committee will try to do their best not to make that happen, put the men and women that are out there in harm's way and were in harm's way that are protecting our country, it would be a disservice to them.

So I thank you for testifying in front of us, and would ask again, I am sure you run into the problem of keeping good people there and do not want to have the decision of telling them that the good people you have got now have to take a pay cut.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Just reiterating the challenge of keeping people in such a highly skilled position as professional staff member on Armed Services in light of pay cuts and downsizing and the difficulty of that. And that is our greatest challenge. As we had mentioned, our staff, you know, drives the show. They write the bill. They do the work. They keep us informed. And, you know, even at their current level, they work significant hours to get this product done. The cuts that are talked about here would be devastating to our ability to continue to produce the product we want to produce.

Mr. MCKEON. We just lost, an example, we lost a staff member who retired after 23 years. He was a retired colonel, and then he came to work for us 23 years. The knowledge that he had for personnel was—it will be very, very difficult to replace. We are not able to at this time to do that. And then we lost another staffer that had been with us for 20 years, a distinguished pilot. In fact, I learned after his death that he flew, as far as we have been able to verify, more combat missions over Vietnam than any other pilot, over 500 and was a great member of our committee. When somebody in the military or somebody, you know, at the Pentagon would try to snow him on something, it was very difficult to do. But again, these people are hard to find and hard to replace when we lose them, hard to keep them—I shouldn't say hard to keep them. They stay because they are very dedicated. But it is hard to get them, have the adequate time to, even though they are highly qualified, to get up to speed with how the committee works and those kind of things. It takes some time to break people in, and the way the budget works, it is very difficult to do that.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, ranking member.

I am proud of both of you, you do an excellent job, and proud to be on that committee.

And I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARPER. I now recognize Mr. Nugent for any questions that he may have.

Mr. NUGENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As the newest member to HASC, it truly is an eye-opening experience. We take our national defense, I think a lot do, just take it for granted that we will always have the best military, one that can protect us against all threats. In my short time sitting on HASC, I see the multiple challenges that we face. We face obviously the sequester and also the continuing resolution. But the threats that we face outside that, that staff that I have dealt with in this short period of time, in the briefings I receive, both classified and unclassified, it really opens your eyes, I believe, to the threats that we are facing. And so I worry about, as we move forward, if we start cutting the budget of Armed Services that has to oversee the great men and women that serve this country, we have the oversight capacity to do that, but it's also important to make sure they have the resources available to them for our sons and daughters that go out to fight, that they have the resources. So the question I think is redundant possibly, but one that is worth asking again. If we were to take the recommendation of this budget cut actually versus what you are requesting, how does that affect us in Armed Services?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Well, first of all, I didn't have the exact number earlier, 96 percent of our staff budget goes to salaries. So it goes to the staff. So there is just no room to find savings anywhere else. We will have to cut staff. And you know, as a new member of the committee, you can appreciate the fact that you are going to play a critical role, as everybody on that committee does, in putting together the final product. And there is a steep learning curve in understanding that the staff is there to help us to figure out how to, you know, accomplish our priorities. If they are not there, it reduces our effectiveness as members of the committee and reduces the effectiveness of the ultimate bill. It really, again, comes down to staff.

And, you know, as I mentioned earlier, you know, because we are so staff dependent, we spend the entire budget that we get. And so an across-the-board budget cut would be really devastating to our ability to perform those tasks.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCKEON. We have 71 authorized slots now on our committee, but we are only filling 67. We would have to go down to 61 is our estimate right now.

You know, I am a little unique in the fact that I have chaired two committees now in this Congress. And I see that there is difference between committees. Most of our leadership people that go into leadership don't become chairmen. The Speaker is an anomaly. He was chairman of the Education Committee. But it was just one committee. I have told him a few things about how committees function differently and kind of surprised him.

The other day we were talking, and I said, we hold a hearing almost every day, full committee. And then subcommittees on top of each other. And he said, "Really?" I said, "Yeah." So I appreciate that you give us the opportunity to come in and explain.

Fortunately, a couple of you are on the committee and see this. But most people in the Congress don't really know. They know what their committee does, the committees they serve on, but they

don't get the breadth of the whole Congress, and they don't see the difference in the committees. If you look at how much our committee is budgeted, how many staff we have, and then look at all of the committees across the gamut and see how many of them get legislation that actually is signed into law during the year, I think that that is a result of key excellent staff that we have and the ability to work together. As I left our committee today, we were listening to three of our combatant commanders, to go down and vote in my other committee. I got there, and the minority had walked out of the committee. I mean, that would never—we wouldn't even think of that in our committee. And it is not the way to get things done. But I would just say that, as you go through your deliberations, please look at the results at the end of the day of what the committees produce, and why we do that, and how we are able to do that, and fund us accordingly, because our work is in the Constitution directed, and we have to carry out that responsibility. And I don't think anybody in the Congress wants us to do less than our best.

Mr. NUGENT. Well, I am glad you pointed out the fact that it is in the Constitution in regards to national defense. And that has to be one of our core priorities. Because without it, nothing else matters at this point, because we won't be able do those things that are important to us, other things that we need to do to serve this country. So I want to, once again, thank you both for your leadership. And it is an honor to serve with both of you. Thank you.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Nugent.

And I thank the witnesses for being here and sharing your insight into what is a difficult time for us all. And I also thank our committee members who participated in these hearings for yesterday and today. And the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:24 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

CANDICE S. MILLER, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

GREGG HARPER, MISSISSIPPI
PHIL GINGREY, GEORGIA
AARON SCHOCK, ILLINOIS
TODD ROKITA, INDIANA
RICH NUGENT, FLORIDA

KELLY CRAVEN, STAFF DIRECTOR

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
1309 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6157
(202) 225-8281
http://cha.house.gov

ROBERT A. BRADY, PENNSYLVANIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

ZOE LOFGREN, CALIFORNIA
JUAN VARGAS, CALIFORNIA

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

JAMIE FLEET, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
House Administration Committee, Questions for the Record
Congressman Phil Gingrey

Question for the Committee on Armed Services:

Chairman McKeon, you mention that should funding be cut by 11% for 2013, "staff slots will have to remain unmanned," and that it will be "necessary for the Committee to implement furlough rotations." Do you feel that this will hinder the Committee's ability to complete the work required of it, such as passing the National Defense Authorization Act?

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, CALIFORNIA, CHAIRMAN
MAC THORNBERRY, TEXAS
WALTER B. JONES, NORTH CAROLINA
J. RANDY FORBES, VIRGINIA
JEFF MILLER, FLORIDA
JOE WILSON, SOUTH CAROLINA
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, NEW JERSEY
ROB BISHOP, UTAH
MICHAEL R. TURNER, OHIO
JOHN KLINE, MINNESOTA
MIKE ROGERS, ALABAMA
TRENT FRANKS, ARIZONA
BILL SHUSTER, PENNSYLVANIA
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, TEXAS
DOUG LAMBORN, COLORADO
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, VIRGINIA
DUNCAN HUNTER, CALIFORNIA
JOHN C. FLEMING, M.D., LOUISIANA
MIKE COFFMAN, COLORADO
E. SCOTT RIGELL, VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, NEW YORK
VICKY HARTZLER, MISSOURI
JOSEPH J. HECK, NEVADA
JON RUNYAN, NEW JERSEY
AUSTIN SCOTT, GEORGIA
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, MISSISSIPPI
MARTHA ROBY, ALABAMA
MO BROOKS, ALABAMA
RICHARD B. NUGENT, FLORIDA
KRISTI L. NOEM, SOUTH DAKOTA
PAUL COOK, CALIFORNIA
JIM BRIDENSTINE, OKLAHOMA
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, OHIO
JACKIE WALORSKI, INDIANA

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

U.S. House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515–6035

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

ADAM SMITH, WASHINGTON, RANKING MEMBER
LORETTA SANCHEZ, CALIFORNIA
MIKE McINTYRE, NORTH CAROLINA
ROBERT A. BRADY, PENNSYLVANIA
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, NEW JERSEY
SUSAN A. DAVIS, CALIFORNIA
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, RHODE ISLAND
RICK LARSEN, WASHINGTON
JIM COOPER, TENNESSEE
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, GUAM
JOE COURTNEY, CONNECTICUT
DAVE LOEBSACK, IOWA
NIKI TSONGAS, MASSACHUSETTS
JOHN R. GARAMENDI, CALIFORNIA
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON Jr., GEORGIA
COLLEEN HANABUSA, HAWAII
JACKIE SPEIER, CALIFORNIA
RON BARBER, ARIZONA
ANDRÉ CARSON, INDIANA
CAROL SHEA PORTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
DANIEL B. MAFFEI, NEW YORK
DEREK KILMER, WASHINGTON
JOAQUIN CASTRO, TEXAS
TAMMY DUCKWORTH, ILLINOIS
SCOTT H. PETERS, CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM L. ENYART, ILLINOIS
PETE P. GALLEGO, TEXAS
MARC A. VEASEY, TEXAS

ROBERT L. SIMMONS, II, STAFF DIRECTOR

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
House Administration Committee, Questions for the Record
Congressman Phil Gingrey

Chairman McKeon, you mention that should funding be cut by 11% for 2013, "staff slots will have to remain unmanned," and that it will be "necessary for the Committee to implement furlough rotations." Do you feel that this will hinder the Committee's ability to complete the work required of it, such as passing the National Defense Authorization Act?

At the proposed 11% cut, the committee will only be able to support 61 staff and even then we may need to implement a furlough system. We will limp by on old equipment and rely on detailees from other agencies to carry out vital oversight work. We will not be able to fill critical vacancies in our Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee or the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

This would cripple committee functions at an important time. The Defense Bill we have already begun work on for FY14 will be one of the most important our committee has ever passed. This is a pivotal time for the Department of Defense; their resources are on the decline while threats around the world are on the rise. These cuts will put at risk quality of the national defense authorization act.

CANDICE S. MILLER, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

GREGG HARPER, MISSISSIPPI
PHIL GINGREY, GEORGIA
AARON SCHOCK, ILLINOIS
TODD ROKITA, INDIANA
RICH NUGENT, FLORIDA

KELLY CRAVEN, STAFF DIRECTOR

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
1309 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6157
(202) 225-8281
http://cha.house.gov

ROBERT A. BRADY, PENNSYLVANIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

ZOE LOFGREN, CALIFORNIA
JUAN VARGAS, CALIFORNIA

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

JAMIE FLEET, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
House Administration Committee, Questions for the Record
Congressman Phil Gingrey

Question for the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

Chairman Upton, in your testimony you mention that the Energy and Commerce Committee has implemented a "paperless testimony policy" in order to reduce printing and copier costs. As a Member of your Committee, I have found that my staff and I are still able to access the information effectively. Have you received feedback from other Committee Members, the public, or the media that this policy is hindering their ability to access information? Additionally, how much does the Committee project saving with implementation of the "paperless testimony policy"?

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
Committee on Energy and Commerce
Responses to Questions for the Record

Question from Congressman Phil Gingrey: Chairman Upton, in your testimony you mention that the Energy and Commerce Committee has implemented a "paperless testimony policy" in order to reduce printing and copier costs. As a Member of your Committee, I have found that my staff and I are still able to access the information effectively. Have you received feedback from other Committee Members, the public, or the media that this policy is hindering their ability to access information? Additionally, how much does the Committee project saving with implementation of the "paperless testimony policy"?

Response: The feedback we have received thus far has been generally positive, with the only complaints surrounding the WiFi capacity issue that we discussed during my appearance before the committee. To ensure Members, the public, and the media are able to access hearing testimony in a timely fashion, we attempt to post the information approximately 24 hours before a hearing begins. This provides ample opportunity for those interested in a hearing to review the materials in advance.

As I mentioned during my testimony, the only hurdle to this paperless testimony policy is the HousePublic WiFi system. Our ability to access hearing information online depends on a robust WiFi infrastructure. Before we launched paperless hearings, my staff discussed it with the CAO to confirm that the House WiFi system could handle the amount of traffic that would come from Members and the public accessing our website during hearings. While they indicated that the WiFi system should have been able to handle the traffic, in practice, we are regularly facing slow connections or no WiFi access at all. We are continuing to work with the CAO on a solution, but CAO informs us that the root issue is that WiFi use on the House campus has increased dramatically, and we simply don't have the infrastructure to manage it.

The Majority alone spent nearly $30,000 on copier fees and supplies in 2012, and testimony duplication was certainly a significant share of our copier usage. We are in the early stages of our efforts to reduce copying costs, and we expect savings to increase over time. Initially, we are projecting a savings of at least $3,500 annually. However, if we are able to actually reduce the number of copiers in our office (thus eliminating the ongoing maintenance charges), we could see even more significant savings. In the coming months as this new policy is fully implemented we will know more about how much we have been able to save, and we appreciate any support you can provide – particularly with respect to increasing the WiFi capacity in the House – to support this effort.

CANDICE S. MILLER, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

GREGG HARPER, MISSISSIPPI
PHIL GINGREY, GEORGIA
AARON SCHOCK, ILLINOIS
TODD ROKITA, INDIANA
RICH NUGENT, FLORIDA

KELLY CRAVEN, STAFF DIRECTOR

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
1309 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6157
(202) 225-8281
http://cha.house.gov

ROBERT A. BRADY, PENNSYLVANIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

ZOE LOFGREN, CALIFORNIA
JUAN VARGAS, CALIFORNIA

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

JAMIE FLEET, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
House Administration Committee, Questions for the Record
Congressman Phil Gingrey

Question for the Committee on Small Business:

Chairman Graves, you mention that in 2013, you anticipate the need to replace various technology and machines, including 9 computers and a copier. Assuming budget cuts, would you be able to replace these items? If you were not able to replace these items immediately, would it greatly hinder your Committee's ability to perform its core functions?

SAM GRAVES, MISSOURI
CHAIRMAN

NYDIA M. VELAZQUEZ, NEW YORK
RANKING MEMBER

Congress of the United States
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Small Business
2361 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6315

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
Response to Question for the Record
Chairman Sam Graves, Committee on Small Business

In response to the question posed by Congressman Phil Gingrey:

The equipment needs of the Committee on Small Business, as reflected in the budget submission for 2013, were primarily determined in two ways. First, some older equipment is beginning to fail. Second, the Committee's technology consultants reviewed our equipment, as they do annually, and provided their assessment of what machines will likely need to be replaced in the short-term. Based on these factors, the Committee established a 2013 budget for new equipment. The Committee staff needs functioning equipment and technology to be as productive and efficient as possible in fulfilling core functions. Productivity and efficiency are even more important at a time when the Committee is operating with limited staff resources due to budget constraints. Equipment failure will require replacement of these items regardless of budget cuts.

CANDICE S. MILLER, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

GREGG HARPER, MISSISSIPPI
PHIL GINGREY, GEORGIA
AARON SCHOCK, ILLINOIS
TODD ROKITA, INDIANA
RICH NUGENT, FLORIDA

KELLY CRAVEN, STAFF DIRECTOR

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
1309 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6157
(202) 225-8281
http://cha.house.gov

ROBERT A. BRADY, PENNSYLVANIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

ZOE LOFGREN, CALIFORNIA
JUAN VARGAS, CALIFORNIA

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

JAMIE FLEET, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress
House Administration Committee, Questions for the Record
Congressman Phil Gingrey

Question for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Chairman Miller, I commend your Committee on its responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars. You mention in your testimony that adding an investigator as a fourth staffer in Oversight and Investigations majority staff is a necessity in this Congress. If you do add this staffer, will you be forced to make cuts elsewhere?

REPUBLICANS
JEFF MILLER, FLORIDA, CHAIRMAN
DOUG LAMBORN, COLORADO
GUS M. BILIRAKIS, FLORIDA
DAVID P. ROE, TENNESSEE
BILL FLORES, TEXAS
JEFF DENHAM, CALIFORNIA
JON RUNYAN, NEW JERSEY
DAN BENISHEK, MICHIGAN
TIM HUELSKAMP, KANSAS
MARK E. AMODEI, NEVADA
MIKE COFFMAN, COLORADO
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, OHIO
PAUL COOK, CALIFORNIA
JACKIE WALORSKI, INDIANA

HELEN W. TOLAR, STAFF DIRECTOR
AND CHIEF COUNSEL

U.S. House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS
335 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
http://veterans.house.gov

DEMOCRATS
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, MAINE, RANKING
CORRINE BROWN, FLORIDA
MARK TAKANO, CALIFORNIA
JULIA BROWNLEY, CALIFORNIA
DINA TITUS, NEVADA
ANN KIRKPATRICK, ARIZONA
RAUL RUIZ, CALIFORNIA
GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD, CALIFORNIA
ANN M. KUSTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
BETO O'ROURKE, TEXAS
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, MINNESOTA

NANCY DOLAN
DEMOCRATIC STAFF DIRECTOR

Committee Funding Hearing for the 113th Congress

House Administration Committee, Questions for the Record

Response to Congressman Phil Gingrey from Chairman Jeff Miller, Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Thank you for your interest in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and specifically, in our efforts to build upon our record of engaged oversight. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your question.

At present, only twenty-five of the committee's thirty-six staff slots are filled; sixteen of the twenty-four majority slots, and nine of the twelve minority slots. As my testimony reflected, adding an investigator at our Oversight and Investigations subcommittee is a staffing priority. The Department of Veterans Affairs, over which the Committee has oversight, is the second largest federal agency, employing over three hundred thousand people with a budget of roughly one hundred forty billion dollars.

I am very proud that we did return money last Congress. We did not fully staff the majority to allow us some flexibility within our budget reduction for an unforeseen expenses, and so that we would not find ourselves in the undesirable position of having to let people go.

At present funding levels, we can make and support this hire. Whether we would have to offset elsewhere in order to fulfill this priority would be determined by the degree to which we sustain cuts. Further cuts, as those sustained in the past, would likely come from personnel funding.

You, and the entire Committee, have my assurance that we will continue to account for, and stretch every dollar afforded the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as we out-stride the expectations placed upon us.