- 1 Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
- 2 RPTS FREEMAN
- 3 HIF059030
- 4
- 5 MARKUP ON:
- 6 H.R. 1068 (BUCSHON), SECURING AMERICA'S CRITICAL MINERALS
- 7 SUPPLY ACT;
- 8 H.R. 1121 (DUNCAN), PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION
- 9 ACT;
- 10 H.R. 1085 (LATTA), RESEARCHING EFFICIENT FEDERAL IMPROVEMENTS
- 11 FOR NECESSARY ENERGY REFINING (REFINER) ACT;
- 12 H.R. 1058 (ARMSTRONG), PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY
- 13 INFRASTRUCTURE ACT;
- 14 H. CON. RES. 14, A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE
- 15 REVOCATION BY PRESIDENT BIDEN OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT FOR
- 16 THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE;
- 17 H. CON. RES. 17, A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF
- 18 CONGRESS THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT IMPOSE ANY
- 19 RESTRICTIONS ON THE EXPORT OF CRUDE OIL OR OTHER PETROLEUM 20 PRODUCTS;
- 21 H.R. 1130 (JOHNSON), UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL 22 ACT;

```
H.R. 1115 (BURGESS), PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR
23
24
    REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT; AND
    H.R. 1160 (WALBERG), CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE
25
26
    CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING ACT
27
28
    TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2023
29
    House of Representatives,
30
    Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security,
31
    Committee on Energy and Commerce,
32
    Washington, D.C.
33
34
35
36
          The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m. in
37
    the Room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Jeff
38
    Duncan [chairman of the subcommittee], presiding.
39
          Present: Representatives Duncan, Curtis, Burgess,
40
41
    Latta, Guthrie, Griffith, Johnson, Bucshon, Walberg, Palmer,
    Lesko, Pence, Armstrong, Weber, Balderson, Pfluger, Rodgers
42
     (ex officio); DeGette, Peters, Fletcher, Matsui, Tonko,
43
    Veasey, Kuster, Schrier, Castor, Cardenas, Blunt Rochester,
44
```

45 and Pallone (ex officio).

Staff Present: Sarah Alexander, Professional Staff 47 Member, Energy and Environment; Kate Arey, Content Manager 48 and Digital Assistant; Jolie Brochin, Clerk, Health; Sarah 49 50 Burke, Deputy Staff Director; Lauren Eriksen, Clerk, O&I; Jack Heretik, Press Secretary; Nate Hodson, Staff Director; 51 Tara Hupman, Chief Counsel; Noah Jackson, Clerk, C&T; Peter 52 Kielty, General Counsel; Emily King, Member Services 53 Director; Elise Krekorian, Professional Staff Member, Energy; 54 55 Mary Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy and Environment; Jacob McCurdy, Professional Staff Member, Energy; Kaitlyn Peterson, 56 Clerk, Energy and Environment; Emma Schultheis, Staff 57 Assistant; Michael Taggart, Policy Director; Waverly Gordon, 58 Minority Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel; Tiffany 59 Guarascio, Minority Staff Director; Perry Hamilton, Minority 60 Member Services and Outreach Manager; Mackenzie Kuhl, 61 Minority Digital Manager; Kris Pittard, Minority Professional 62 Staff Member; Greq Pugh, Minority Staff Assistant; Kylea 63 Rogers, Minority Policy Analyst; Andrew Souvall, Minority 64 65 Director of Communications, Outreach, and Member Services; Medha Surampudy, Minority Professional Staff Member; and 66 Tuley Wright, Minority Staff Director, Energy, Climate, and 67 Grid Security. 68

69

*Mr. Duncan. The Energy Subcommittee will come to order
for the Energy Subcommittee markup.

I want to thank you all for being here today. I am excited to chair our first Energy Subcommittee markup, take up a set of bills to increase American energy production and restore energy leadership.

76 I recognize myself for an opening statement.

The United States became the global leader in energy production and energy-related greenhouse gas emission reductions. This success was the result of Federal policies that encouraged innovation and investment in the energy industry, policies that unleashed American energy.

Unfortunately, the rush-to-green agenda and misguided government policies of the last couple of years have taken an aggressive, top-down regulatory approach that has decreased domestic energy production, reduced energy supplies, and increased the cost for consumers.

Energy is the foundation of everything in American life. High energy prices hurt low-income and middle-class Americans the most. According to the EIA, one-third of American households struggle to pay their energy bills. We went from being energy dominant on the world stage to a self-inflicted

92 energy crisis. We are facing energy scarcity, record high93 gas prices, and less reliable grid.

Republicans have solutions to make us yet again energy dominant, and I am grateful that we have an opportunity today to take up our first set of bills seeking to achieve this goal.

I also want to note that these bills went entirely through regular order. We had a full committee hearing in January to inform us on the state of American energy, as well as a field hearing in Midland, Texas. The subcommittee also held a legislative hearing the first week of February to hear expert testimony on how to better the bills, and we are now holding a subcommittee markup.

105 All the bills today seek to unleash American energy, 106 make energy more affordable for all Americans, and secure 107 energy supply chains.

My bill, H.R. 1121, protects American energy production by prohibiting the President from declaring a moratorium on fracking. It also reaffirms that states have primacy over production on state and private lands. This is necessary, because President Biden has repeatedly stated that he would end fossil fuel production in the United States.

To address energy infrastructure permitting we have Mr. Armstrong's bill, H.R. 1058, Promoting Cross-border Energy Infrastructure Act, which encourages the construction of the energy infrastructure across the borders of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico, helping us secure Western hemispheric energy security.

There is also Dr. Burgess's legislation aimed at streamlining natural gas pipeline permitting process at FERC. Increasing pipeline capacity in the United States is key to our energy security.

Several bills also address the importance of American energy exports in the global market. The world is safer when America is energy dominant, and Representative Johnson's bill to unlock our domestic LNG would make it easier for FERC to approve export terminals to deliver clean energy to our allies.

We will also be taking up a resolution from Representative Guthrie that expresses support for the free trade and the export of crude oil and petroleum products. This is necessary because President Biden and Democrats on this committee have advocated for reinstating the crude oil export ban. Lifting the export ban in 2015 has lowered

136 prices, while also increasing our leverage globally. It 137 would be short-sighted to reverse this.

Dr. Bucshon's bill, H.R. 1068, Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act, requires the Secretary of Energy to assess our critical energy resources supply chain to ensure we have a secure and available supply.

Mr. Latta's bill, H.R. 1085, the REFINER Act, requires the National Petroleum Council to submit a report on our refining capacity. It is essential we address not only expanded production, but also refining capacity to meet the growing demand.

We all know President Biden revoked the permit for the Keystone XL permit -- pipeline permit on his first day in office. This began his war on American energy. Mrs. Lesko has a resolution expressing disapproval of President Biden's revocation of the permit.

In addition to these bills, I am hopeful we can continue to work across the aisle to secure our nuclear supply chain and strengthen our grid, including the bipartisan cybersecurity bill from Representatives Walberg and Schrier. Our goal is to enact policy that delivers affordable,

157 reliable, and clean energy to all Americans, a goal I believe

that we all share on this committee, regardless of what 158 These bills are a step to increase supply and 159 party. infrastructure, reducing prices so Americans aren't forced to 160 161 decide between putting food on the table or keeping the They also get us back to being a global energy lights on. 162 leader, so we no longer have to beg our adversaries for 163 164 energy.

165 It is time to increase American energy production, 166 restore American energy leadership, flip the switch on 167 American energy. I urge all my colleagues to support the 168 bills in front of us today so we can achieve this goal. 169 And I will now recognize the Ranking Member DeGette for 170 an opening statement.

171 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and I 172 guess I can commend you for going through regular order in 173 the sense that you had a hearing and now a markup on these 174 bills.

But there are 30 people on this panel on both sides of the aisle, and I have spent time working on legislation with most of them. I think we have a real opportunity to come together in this Congress in a meaningful way to advance bipartisan energy policies that will help move our committee

180 forward -- or our country forward, because everybody I have 181 talked to on this committee, Democrats and Republicans, want 182 to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable and 183 reliable energy.

Everybody I have spoken to agrees we need to do more to improve the security and functionality of our nation's energy grid, so they can handle the capacity needs of the 21st century, and all of us want to see America as truly energy independent from the rest of the world.

So I think it is a real opportunity lost, Mr. Chairman, 189 even though we went through regular order, that the bills we 190 are going to be considering today won't solve any of these 191 issues, and are, in fact, Republican messaging bills, because 192 they don't do anything to break out nation's addiction to 193 oil, they don't do anything to lower the cost of energy for 194 hardworking Americans, or to make it more reliable. They 195 don't do anything to increase our nation's energy security. 196 They don't do anything to make our nation more energy 197 198 independent, and they don't strengthen the grids.

199 So there we go.

200 What the bills do is they make us more reliant on oil 201 and gas. They make us more reliant on the global natural gas

202 market, and the potentially devastating price fluctuations 203 that we have already seen that come with it. They double 204 down on oil and gas production at a time where every country 205 in the world is investing in clean energy production. They 206 bolster an energy -- or an industry that is already 207 performing at one of its highest levels in history, and 208 reporting record-high profits as a result.

In fact, two of the measures before us today would allow Big Oil to increase exports of fossil fuels from this country, which, as we learned last year, does nothing to bring down energy prices for hardworking Americans, but instead is a huge gift to help pad the already sky-high profits of the oil and gas industry.

Another bill before us, H.R. 1115, would fast-track the construction of new gas -- natural gas pipelines by limiting the government's ability to look at the environmental harms they might cause.

Another is a back-door attempt to resurrect the Keystone pipeline, which was abandoned almost two years ago.

And so, if we really want to bring down the cost of energy at home -- and I think we all do -- if we really want to pursue an energy policy that would provide Americans the

affordable and reliable energy they need, and if we really want to make our country more energy-independent, then we need to break our reliance on fossil fuels, and make the transition to clean energy, all types of clean energy, as soon as possible.

Other countries are already doing it, our allies around 229 the world who understand the potential that clean energy 230 brings to both the economies and their way of life, are 231 232 moving now to make the transition as quickly as possible. And frankly, I don't know why we wouldn't want to do the 233 Why not? It economically benefits the industry. 234 same. America has been the global leader on so many issues for 235 so many years, and it is time for us to be a global leader on 236 this issue, as well. We don't need to expand oil and gas 237 production in our quest for energy independence any more. 238 And by expediting the transition to clean energy, we can 239 break our reliance on the global market. By expanding the 240 use and deployment of clean energy technologies across the 241 242 country, we can grow our economy while protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink. 243

244 So I would suggest, instead of ramming through the bills 245 before us today, I would urge the subcommittee to work

together to come up with real bipartisan solutions to the issues we face.

248 So after we finish doing this little messaging day 249 today, let's sit down, let's work together, and let's really 250 come up with some bipartisan solutions, because I think our 251 economy and our constituents and our energy future demand it. 252 I yield back.

*Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. The chair
will now recognize the chairwoman of the full committee, Mrs.
McMorris Rodgers, for five minutes for an opening statement.

The Chair. This morning the subcommittee will take up nine bills to continue our work to unleash American energy, lower energy costs, strengthen supply chains. These are the key elements for ensuring reliable, secure, and affordable delivery of energy to all Americans, to their homes, to their businesses, the grocery stores, and everywhere in between.

From gas to hydro to nuclear, these energy and climate solutions will help ensure we are good stewards of the environment, that we unlock our new -- a new era of American technological leadership and innovation, remove regulatory barriers, and put energy security back in the center of energy policy.

For example, Dr. Bucshon's bill will require the Department of Energy to identify the critical energy resources that are vulnerable to supply disruptions. This would provide essential information to make decisions concerning threats to our supply chains, and those threats are present and growing.

274 China has been termed the OPEC of green energy 275 materials. Yet China's overall share of the energy minerals 276 processing actually surpasses OPEC's 34 percent of oil 277 market, 40 percent of copper, 70 percent of cobalt and 278 lithium, and 90 percent for rare earth minerals. We must 279 reverse this dangerous trend and secure our energy materials 280 supply.

281 We also must examine the role of petrochemical refiners 282 for energy security, and affordable transportation fuels. 283 This is the goal of Mr. Latta's legislation. More 284 predictable permitting is necessary to expand American energy 285 supplies and to operate the facilities to process advanced 286 materials.

287 Several bills this morning will help grow energy 288 markets, improve the permitting coordination with our North 289 American energy partners, and across states. Opening markets

and providing access to these markets with pipelines and export terminals will increase the supplies that make energy and power more affordable.

I want to thank Mr. Johnson, Mr. Armstrong, Dr. Burgess, and Mr. Guthrie for their leadership on solutions that update our export policies, and ensure more coordinated and predictable permitting for energy infrastructure.

I commend the work of Chair Duncan and Mrs. Lesko for developing their solutions on producing and transporting natural gas, a key energy source that is also low in emissions.

And very importantly, I look forward to discussing Mr. Walberg's bipartisan bill to protect energy systems from hazards, especially cyber threats. We cannot achieve the full benefits of an American energy expansion without reforms like these.

While President Biden is focused on command-and-control transition to unreliable and weather-dependent energy, we are leading today for American energy to build a prosperous future, a future that is more secure, clean, and affordable. This is a start, a solid start to our energy agenda. Of course, there is more to do.

We must confront our serious nuclear fuel security 312 313 vulnerabilities, which are made worse by outdated policies that allowed our nuclear fuel infrastructure to atrophy to 314 315 unacceptable levels. It is one year since Russia's invasion of Ukraine, yet more than 20 percent of nuclear fuels for 316 American reactors continue to come from Russia. 317 This amounted to over 850 million for the Russian regime last year 318 It is a major supply threat and a security threat. 319 alone. 320 Congress must work to ban Russian imports, and send the market signal needed to restore American nuclear fuel 321 infrastructure. That is the purpose of my bill, H.R. 1042, 322 the Reduce Russian Uranium Imports Act. 323

I want to thank the Ranking Member Pallone for working with me to bring this bill to a future markup. We must work together to make sure that America is not reliant on Russia. With that, let's go to work, Mr. Chairman, for the American people and for our energy and national security. I yield back.

*Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentlelady, and I will now recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, for a five-minutes opening statement.

334 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

335 Today committee Republicans are once again showing that they plan to prioritize the needs of big oil and gas 336 337 companies over the needs of the American people. It is unfortunate, because there are many members on our side of 338 the aisle who have voiced interest in durable bipartisan 339 solutions that would allow us to build more clean energy 340 infrastructure to ensure we lead the world in the transition 341 342 to a clean energy economy. This market demonstrates that is not the approach that the Republican majority is looking to 343 344 take.

Republicans love to talk about an all-of-the-above 345 approach to building our energy assets, but none of the bills 346 we are marking up either addresses or even references clean 347 This markup is in stark contrast to committee 348 energy. Democrats delivering historic wins for the American people. 349 We enacted the Inflation Reduction Act that has already 350 created more than 100,000 good-paying, clean energy American 351 352 jobs, will cut costs for working families, and tackle the worsening climate crisis. 353

Today Republicans are bringing up eight partisan bills that have no chance of ever becoming law. They know this,

because they are literally some of the same bills that they pushed through the last time they were in charge of the House, more than four years ago. And at that time there was a Republican President and a Republican-controlled Senate, and they still couldn't get them enacted. But here they are again, attempting to move these same old bills.

H.R. 1058, the Promoting Cross-border Energy 362 Infrastructure Act, is nothing more than a shadow approval of 363 364 the Keystone pipeline masquerading as legislation. It establishes that every single cross-border energy project is 365 presumptively in the public interest, unless proven 366 otherwise. And this is nothing more than a green light for 367 oil and gas pipeline developers to construct international 368 facilities without sufficient oversight from the Federal 369 Government. 370

H.R. 1130, the so-called Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act, removes the requirement that the Department of Energy determine proposed LNG exports are within the public interest. This Republican bill would lead to more American LNG being sent to China. So much for Republican claims of being tough on China.

377

By removing the public interest test for natural gas

exports, both H.R. 1130 and H. Con. Res 17 create a handout to our geopolitical rivals and to Republicans' fossil fuel friends at the expense of the American consumer. At a time when many Americans across the country are suffering from high energy costs this winter, these Republican bills would ensure that the problem worsens in the coming years.

H.R. 1115 effectively makes the Federal Energy 384 Regulatory Commission, or FERC, the final arbiter on all 385 386 things environmentally review related for natural gas pipelines. Unfortunately, in that process it sets up a 387 likely adversarial relationship between FERC and other 388 Federal and state agencies that play a role both in writing 389 environmental reviews for pipelines and in the permitting 390 391 process.

I understand that Republicans believe this bill will speed up the process for natural gas pipeline approval, but I think it will actually do the opposite, and turn what is currently a thorough, collaborative process between agencies into an adversarial one. In fact, this was the fear that FERC's director of the Office of Energy Projects testified to back in 2017.

399

Now, most of the remainder of the bills, I think, are

meaningless, pure signals to the fossil fuel industry that 400 401 Republicans support them. H. Con. Res. 14 is a grasp to resurrect the Keystone pipeline, showing Republicans are 402 403 still stuck in the energy debates of the last decade; H.R. 150 would override our environmental and public lands laws to 404 protect Big Oil and Gas's ability to frack; and H.R. 1085 405 merely generates a report representing the oil industry's 406 views under the auspices of a government agency. 407

There is one bill, however, that does have some potential, and that is H.R. 1160, a bipartisan bill sponsored by Representatives Schrier and Walberg. It gets at an issue where we have been able to find some common ground with Republicans, and that is energy infrastructure,

413 cybersecurity. We support the Department of Energy's role in 414 protecting our electric infrastructure. And historically, we 415 have worked together on this important issue.

But aside from this bill, none of the others offer real solutions to the complex energy problems and challenges of the 21st century. If Republicans really want to unleash American energy, I invite them to stop trying to tear down critical climate and environmental programs, and work with us to build a better future for all by finding a way to build

422	clean energy quickly without endangering our environment.
423	And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
424	*Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman, and before I
425	recognize other members for an opening statement I would like
426	to enter into the record an article it is actually an
427	editorial board opinion from the Wall Street Journal: SOS
428	for the U.S. Electric Grid. It really sums up some of the
429	problems in the rush to renewables, and where the shortfalls
430	are going to be, taking fossil fuel generation offline.
431	So I enter that for the record, without objection. So
432	ordered.
433	[The information follows:]
434	
435	********COMMITTEE INSERT*******
436	

437 *Mr. Duncan. Okay, any members wishing to have an438 opening statement?

The chair will recognize Mr. Latta for three minutes. Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding today's markup. It is very important. I believe it is important that we acknowledge the fact that, as Republicans promised, we are rolling up our sleeves and starting the work that the American people sent us here to do through regular order and in full transparency.

Thank you, Madam Chair and to our subcommittee chair, for your shared commitment to ensuring this committee and subcommittee work as they were intended under the rules. Today I am glad to see that this subcommittee is marking up a collection of bills that will put the United States back on track in our efforts to provide the American people with access to affordable and reliable energy.

In just two years the Biden Administration has done immense harm to the cause of American energy independence. Rather than unleashing American energy, President Biden has begged countries like Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and the rest of OPEC for assistance with gas prices. Republicans understand that we should be supporting all domestic sources

459	of energy development, and not picking winners and losers in					
460	order to pursue costly and workable climate policies.					
461	The slate of bills before us today will kickstart our					
462	efforts to reverse these disastrous policies, and return the					
463	United States to its position as the preeminent global energy					
464	producer.					
465	I look forward to discussing my legislation, REFINER					
466	Act, and hearing from my colleagues on their energy					
467	solutions, as well.					
468	Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.					
469	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members wishing to provide an					
470	opening statement?					
471	Mr. Pfluger is recognized.					
472	*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.					
473	Over the last several weeks this committee has heard					
474	expert testimony, both here in D.C. and in my district in					
475	Midland, Texas, on the need for the Federal Government to					
476	unleash American energy to supply the resources for our					
477	allies and lower the cost here at home.					
478	This Administration has made it clear; the President					
479	campaigned on this. He said he was going to end fossil					
480	fuels. These efforts to reduce supply will not reduce demand					
	23					

of natural gas, it will only hand the keys to China and Russia, while destroying American small businesses. The U.S. has the ability to supply the world with secure, reliable energy. Increasing exports to our partners and allies will strengthen their security, boost our economy, and make America stronger on the world stage.

In my district in the Permian Basin, starting in 2008 in 487 the shale revolution, we have literally transformed the 488 489 world. We have literally lowered the cost for every American family. And it saddens me to hear the words of my colleagues 490 on the other side of the aisle who chose not to come to the 491 field hearings, who chose not to meet my constituents, and 492 calls my constituents Big Oil. I am not -- I couldn't 493 disagree with that more. I wish that my colleagues would 494 come to Midland, Texas and hear the testimony of Mayor Lori 495 Blong, or hear the testimony of Adrian Carrasco, his 64 496 employees. I am sorry, but these are not Big Oil. These are 497 everyday families who are putting their hard work, their 498 499 blood, sweat, and tears into actually reducing the cost for Americans to the tune of about \$10,000 a year. 500

501 To hear the word that allowing exports does nothing for 502 our country, there is an all-out assault through every

policy, through every executive order, through every piece of 503 504 legislation in the last Congress on the industry that literally is the foundation for this country's economy, and 505 506 the foundation for this country's national security. And to think about Adrian Carrasco and his 64 employees in Midland, 507 Texas, and to have my colleagues on the other side of the 508 aisle call them Big Oil, when every single day, no matter how 509 hot or how cold it is, they are going to work, they are 510 511 putting food on the table for their families, they are making their communities stronger, and in the process of doing so 512 they are providing affordable, reliable energy. 513

I would like to thank the chairman of the full 514 committee, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, and the chairman of this 515 subcommittee, Mr. Duncan, for actually getting back to the 516 facts. It is kind of like we are living in the Twilight Zone 517 with some of these testimonies. The facts don't support what 518 this country actually needs. The narrative does not support 519 what this country actually needs. Let's get to the facts. 520 521 Let's look at the economy and the market forces that are at play. And by unleashing American energy and allowing private 522 industry to do what it is done for so long, winning World War 523 II and so many other factors throughout the decades, I think 524

525	we are on the right track, and I commend the chairman for
526	putting this markup together to unleash American energy.
527	I yield back.
528	*Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman. Any other members
529	wishing to provide an opening statement?
530	Okay, hearing none, I have a point of personal
531	privilege. I am a grandfather as of 5:19 yesterday.
532	[Applause.]
533	*Mr. Duncan. A little grandson, eight pounds, four
534	ounces. His name is John Whalen JW, they are going to
535	call him Duncan. And that is my middle son, John Philip,
536	JP. So anyway, all right, so that is what it is about, the
537	future of this country, what we are doing for our kids and
538	our grandkids. And so I am excited.
539	All right, let's get to work. The chair will now call
540	up H.R. 1068, and ask the clerk to report the bill.
541	*The Clerk. H.R. 1068, to amend the Department of
542	Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical
543	energy resources, including critical minerals and other
544	materials, and for other purposes.
545	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
546	the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for
	26

547 amendment at any point. 548 So ordered. 549 [The bill follows:] 550 551 *******COMMITTEE INSERT******** 552

*Mr. Duncan. Are there bipartisan amendments to the 553 554 bill? Hearing none, any other amendments to the bill? 555 556 *Mr. Bucshon. This is 1068, right? *Mr. Duncan. All right. So the chair will now 557 recognize the author of the bill, H.R. 1068, as amended -- or 558 not amended -- to speak on it. 559 Mr. Bucshon, you are recognized for five minutes. 560 561 *Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am excited to be here today to participate in the markup of nine important 562 pieces of legislation that work together to unleash American 563 energy production. 564 I want to make special note of this bill, H.R. 1068, the 565 Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act. And this 566 should be a bipartisan goal. Over the last few years, this 567 committee has discussed the importance of critical minerals 568 and other energy resources necessary to providing for our 569 energy needs. We also know we must consider the potential 570 571 vulnerabilities of existing supply chains and domestic production and processing capacity. 572 With new sources of energy generation coming online, we 573

28

must take steps to ensure we safeguard the supply chains of

575 our energy resources to protect our constituents from major 576 price fluctuations in their energy bills, as well as prevent 577 our adversaries from weaponizing potential vulnerabilities in 578 these supply chains.

Currently, the U.S. imports 65 percent of its rare earth 579 These rare earth minerals are required for a 580 minerals. diverse, all-of-the-above energy transition. By importing 581 these materials from foreign countries, the U.S. is left 582 583 beholden to manipulation, potentially, from foreign adversaries. The U.S. could produce these minerals in a 584 manner that is cleaner and safer than other parts of the 585 world, where production is tied to dangerous working 586 conditions, child labor, exploitation, and extremely low pay. 587 I believe H.R. 1068 will provide the Department of 588 Energy an essential tool to help secure our nation's energy 589 needs by ensuring that the Secretary of Energy is engaged 590 productively in addressing this multi-faceted issue. 591 Specifically, the bill would require the Secretary of Energy 592 593 to conduct an assessment of our nation's energy supply, identify resources that are critical to our economy and 594 vulnerabilities in the supply chains of critical energy 595 resources, and determine the extent to which critical energy 596

597 resources play a role in developing new energy technologies. 598 The bill defines critical energy resources as those that 599 are "essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the 600 United States and the supply chain of which is vulnerable to 601 disruption.' '

The bill would also direct the Secretary of Energy to diversify energy sourcing and increase domestic production, refining, and processing of these critical resources.

As a supporter of an all-of-the-above approach, energy approach, it is crucial that we take steps to safeguard and secure the energy resources necessary to keep the lights on, rates down, and emissions low.

I want to thank those of my colleagues who are already cosponsors of this legislation, and I urge all members of the subcommittee to support H.R. 1068.

I yield back the balance of my time.

613 *Mr. Duncan. Does any other member wish to be

614 recognized on the bill?

615 The gentleman is recognized.

616 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you --

617 *Mr. Duncan. For what purpose do you seek recognition?

618 *Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.
*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I voice my
opposition to H.R. 1068, the Securing America's Critical
Infrastructure Act.

The Department of Energy is doing great work on developing and enhancing critical mineral supply chains. I do not have a problem with codifying these efforts into DoE's responsibilities under the DoE Organization Act. But unfortunately, this bill goes well beyond that goal.

I and many of my Democratic colleagues acknowledge that critical minerals are an important part of the clean energy transition. But this bill is about much more than just critical minerals, and creates ambiguities which could be exploited by the oil and gas industry.

First, this bill uses a definition of "critical energy 633 resource' ' which is incredibly broad, and open to 634 interpretation. It could apply to anything pertaining to 635 energy, including natural gas, petroleum, and coal. It is 636 certainly not restricted to critical minerals, and is not 637 designed to actually help our transition to clean energy 638 alternatives. This will also come up later at today's 639 Environment Subcommittee markup. But this overly broad 640

definition of "critical energy resources' ' is a non-starter. 641 Additionally, this bill creates ambiguity by potentially 642 expanding DoE authority over domestic production, separation 643 644 and processing, authorities that have been traditionally housed at the Environmental Protection Agency and the 645 Department of the Interior. DoE has great expertise. 646 We should identify where the agency excels, and give them clear 647 direction to focus on those given issues. Unfortunately, by 648 649 expanding their mandate into areas that have traditionally been led by EPA and Interior, we are moving away from those 650 agencies' expertise of how best to protect the communities 651 and lands and extraction and production processes. 652

With that said, I do think there are bipartisan efforts 653 that we could work on to address our nation's critical 654 mineral needs. For example, there are cutting-edge 655 technology developers working to improve the transparency of 656 critical mineral supply chains. They are developing 657 voluntary digital battery identification systems, so that 658 manufacturers can easily know and verify where minerals are 659 being sourced from. Bringing this added transparency to 660 battery manufacturing is an important step towards supporting 661 domestic sources of these minerals, including from recyclers. 662

663	So rather than masquerading under critical energy					
664	resource, which could mean oil, gas, and coal, we should work					
665	together on specific critical mineral issues, which everyone					
666	here acknowledges need to be addressed to support the					
667	transition to clean energy. I truly hope that we can find					
668	some common ground on these issues.					
669	But unfortunately, this bill, along with so many of the					
670	others under consideration today, are not going to address					
671	our nation's energy needs.					
672	And with that, Mr. Chair, I yield back my time, and					
673	encourage members to oppose this bill.					
674	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any other					
675	members seeking recognition?					
676	Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding H.R.					
677	1068 to the full committee.					
678	All those in favor, say aye.					
679	Those opposed, no.					
680	And the ayes have it.					
681	*Mr. Bucshon. Mr. Chairman?					
682	*Mr. Duncan. Yes.					
683	*Mr. Bucshon. Bucshon. I ask for a roll call vote.					
684	*Mr. Duncan. Okay, the gentleman asked for a roll call					
	33					

685	vote	, and	so the	clerk	will d	call	the	roll.
686		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Burges	ss?		
687		*Mr.	Burgess	s. Vot	ces aye	€.		
688		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Burges	ss vo	otes	aye.
689		Rep.	Latta?					
690		*Mr.	Latta.	Aye.				
691		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Latta	vote	es ay	e.
692		Rep.	Guthrie	e?				
693		*Mr.	Guthrie	e. Aye	€.			
694		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Guthri	ie vo	otes	aye.
695		Rep.	Griffit	h?				
696		[No 1	response	e.]				
697		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Johnso	on?		
698		*Mr.	Johnsor	n. Joł	nnson v	votes	s aye	•
699		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Johnso	on vo	otes	aye.
700		Rep.	Bucshor	1?				
701		*Mr.	Bucshor	n. Aye	e.			
702		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Bucsho	on vo	otes	aye.
703		Rep.	Walberg	J ?				
704		*Mr.	Walberg	g. Aye	e .			
705		*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Walber	rg vo	otes	aye.
706		Rep.	Palmer?					

707	*Mr. Palmer. Aye.
708	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes aye.
709	Rep. Curtis?
710	*Mr. Curtis. [Inaudible.]
711	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.
712	Rep. Lesko?
713	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
714	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
715	Rep. Pence?
716	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
717	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.
718	Rep. Armstrong?
719	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
720	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes aye.
721	Rep. Weber?
722	[No response.]
723	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson?
724	*Mr. Balderson. [Inaudible.]
725	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.
726	Rep. Pfluger?
727	*Mr. Pfluger. Aye.
728	*The Clerk. Rep. Pfluger votes aye.

729	Rep.	Rodgers	?	
730	*The	Chair.	[Ina	udible.]
731	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Rodgers votes aye.
732	Rep.	Duncan?		
733	*Mr.	Duncan.	Aye	
734	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Duncan votes aye.
735	Rep.	DeGette	?	
736	*Ms.	DeGette	. []]	naudible.]
737	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	DeGette votes no.
738	Rep.	Peters?		
739	[No 1	response	•]	
740	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Fletcher?
741	[No 1	response	•]	
742	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Matsui?
743	*Ms.	Matsui.	No.	
744	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Matsui votes no.
745	Rep.	Tonko?		
746	*Mr.	Tonko.	[Ina	udible.]
747	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Tonko votes no.
748	Rep.	Veasey?		
749	*Mr.	Veasey.	No.	
750	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Veasey votes no.
				26
751	Rep. Kuster?			
-----	--			
752	*Ms. Kuster. No.			
753	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.			
754	Rep. Schrier?			
755	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]			
756	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.			
757	Rep. Castor?			
758	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]			
759	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.			
760	Rep. Sarbanes?			
761	[No response.]			
762	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?			
763	[No response.]			
764	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester?			
765	[No response.]			
766	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone?			
767	*Mr. Pallone. No.			
768	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.			
769	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members wishing to record a			
770	vote?			
771	The clerk will report the total.			
772	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 15 ayes			
	27			

773 and 8 noes. 774 *Mr. Duncan. In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the bill is agreed to. 775 The chair now calls up H.R. 1121, and asks the clerk to 776 777 report. *The Clerk. H.R. 1121, to prohibit a moratorium on the 778 779 use of hydraulic fracturing. *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of 780 the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for 781 amendment at any point. 782 So ordered. 783 [The bill follows:] 784 785 786 787

*Mr. Duncan. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the 788 789 bill? Any other amendments to the bill? 790 791 The chair will now recognize the gentleman, which is myself, for an opening statement on the bill. 792 H.R. 1121 prevents the President from implementing a 793 fracking ban. It prohibits the President from declaring a 794 moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing, unless 795 796 Congress authorizes such a moratorium. It also expresses a sense of Congress that states should 797 maintain primacy for the regulation of oil and gas production 798 on state and private lands. That is where the success 799 happened in North Dakota, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, and 800 801 other energy-producing states over the last decade or more. Under current law, each state has primary regulatory 802 authority over oil and gas, natural gas production. This was 803 made clear in the Bipartisan Energy Policy Act of 2005. 804 State regulatory bodies are best informed to regulate 805 806 operations in their own state, and this bill reaffirms that. America has been blessed with an abundance of natural 807 resources. The discovery of natural gas through the shale 808 revolution has launched America toward energy dominance. 809

Innovation in the oil and gas sector has made the United States a leader in not only energy production, but also emissions reductions.

Unfortunately, the Biden Administration has continued to wage war on American energy, which implicitly creates uncertainty, causing energy investments to stall. President Biden has promised to end oil and gas production in the United States multiple times, and has followed through with executive actions and regulations that have made energy more difficult to produce.

Should he take his actions a step further and impose a 820 moratorium on fracking, energy prices would rise, 821 disproportionately hurting low-income and middle-class 822 Americans, and it will quickly force the United States into 823 being a net importer, and increase the cost of numerous 824 hydrocarbon-derived products: face masks, fertilizer, 825 diapers, plastics, renewables, electric vehicles, and there 826 827 is a whole litany of things that come out of a barrel of 828 hydrocarbon.

Placing a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing would mean a \$900 billion increase in U.S. energy costs, 7.1 trillion in potential losses to the U.S. economy through the year 2030.

With the cost of living dramatically increasing for all 832 833 Americans, an increase in the cost of energy will most affect the wallets of our most vulnerable citizens. 834 835 Natural gas is a clean, affordable, and reliable source of energy. We should be increasing production, not 836 prohibiting that. The United States produces energy cleaner, 837 safer than nearly anywhere in the world, and we need policies 838 that reflect this reality instead of ones that undercut our 839 840 successes. We need to unleash more American energy, not the other way around. More innovations in the energy sector like 841 we saw in the shale revolution is the best way to reduce 842 emissions, bring down prices, undercut the leverage of our 843 adversaries internationally. 844 So I urge support of H.R. 1121 to increase American 845

energy production and restore energy leadership. And with that, I will yield back.

*Mr. Burgess. Mr. Chairman, would you yield to me?
*Mr. Duncan. Yes, I will yield.

*Mr. Burgess. Thank you. You know, it is difficult to overstate the importance that the Energy Policy Act of 2005 had to natural gas production in this country. And I can't believe that it is necessary to continue to try to protect

But indeed, here we are today, and it is. And so I am 854 that. 855 grateful that the chairman is providing that protection. But I will just remind you, as we sat in this committee 856 857 in 2005, the United States was facing a shortage of natural The people from the American Chemistry Council were 858 qas. coming into my office saying, "What are we going to do? We 859 won't have the feedstock for chemicals that we need to 860 manufacture.' ' Farmers were coming in and saying, "What are 861 862 we going to do? We won't have the fertilizer that we need to grow our crops.' ` And all of this was addressed in the 863 Energy Policy Act of 2005 by placing a restriction on the 864 regulations that could be placed on this relatively new 865 866 technology.

867 It is important to me because the district that I represent was kind of the birthplace for that, with Devon 868 Energy. The Barnett Shale was 8,000 feet below our feet, and 869 fracking made exposition of the gas from that shale possible. 870 And to be perfectly honest, in the 2008 recession we could 871 hardly feel it in my part of the north -- of north Texas, 872 because of the benefits that that shale gas brought our 873 economy, locally. That benefit accrues to my state, to our 874 country. We should not foreclose upon it easily. 875

876	So I thank the gentleman for bringing his bill today.
877	It is critically important. It is the work that this
878	committee has provided, the foundation which we laid in the
879	Energy Policy Act of 2005. Let's not soon forget that.
880	I will yield back.
881	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back, and I yield
882	back the balance. Any other members wishing to be
883	recognized?
884	The gentleman from Texas is recognized.
885	*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman
886	*Mr. Duncan. For what purpose do you seek recognition?
887	*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to speak.
888	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.
889	*Mr. Veasey. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I just
890	want to say that I won't be supporting the amendment. I
891	think that a lot of this is really designed and aimed to hurt
892	the President. I don't think that is necessarily a good
893	debate over gas policy and energy security.
894	Congressman Burgess is right, that was the natural gas
895	well that started the fracking revolution in his district.
896	It was the Mitchell oil well gas well, excuse me, in his
897	district in Denton County that kind of kicked it all off.

898	And we need to talk about, you know, some of these
899	things. But I think that the way that we are talking about
900	them today is not right. And I just wanted to make that
901	known, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for yielding to me.
902	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members seeking recognition?
903	Mr. Pfluger, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
904	*Mr. Pfluger. Well, Chairman, thank you for bringing
905	this extremely important bill.

When you look at the choices that Germany has made 20 years ago, when they decided to end fracking, they are now coming to the United States of America, and they are asking for our product because they don't have it. They are trying to diversify away from Russian natural gas. And when you look at what the shale revolution has done, we are over 40 percent cleaner than Russian natural gas.

I see several members on the other side of the aisle who actually were in Midland last week. I would invite every member to come, please come and see a well completion. I invite you to come to my district. I was disappointed to not have more when we had a field hearing.

918 *Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

919 *Mr. Pfluger. Sure.

*Ms. DeGette. So I agree, these field hearings are very important. And as I just mentioned to the chairman, this field hearing was held without consultation during a recess week, without consultation to the minority. And many of us would have liked to have been at that field hearing. I wouldn't have interrupted it to say this, but the gentleman has now said it twice.

927 So next time we have a field hearing, if it is cleared 928 through my schedule, at least, I will be happy to join you. 929 And P.S., I have been to wells in Colorado, too. Thank you. 930 *Mr. Pfluger. Reclaiming my time, I invite anyone to 931 come at any point in time, regardless of whether we have a 932 field hearing or not.

933 But it is so critically important, what this industry has done, not because the government has told them to do it 934 -- and I think this bill protects what we originally did 935 through private industry, not through the government, not 936 through government mandate, not through anything the EPA or 937 938 FERC or any of the other agencies said, but because private industry wanted to make it more efficient, more affordable, 939 more reliable. 940

941

And now we are in a situation where, just this morning,

the Embassy of Japan has said, "Can I please meet with you?' ' 942 943 And I know the ranking member knows this very well, that the Embassy of Japan said, "Can we please meet with you, because 944 945 we need LNG, we need product.' ' That is how we do business here in the United States. We cannot follow the path that 946 countries like Germany and others have gone down, where now, 947 20 years later, their policies have put their entire 948 populations into a real problem of not having affordable, 949 950 reliable energy.

I want to commend the chairman for an excellent bill that we should not have to legislate. But unfortunately, because of political climate, we do.

Once again, anybody on the other side of the aisle is welcome to come to my district or any others where we do this, and we do it better than anybody else in the world. That is why we need to keep these American jobs here, and continue not only to supply our needs, but those of our partners and allies.

960 I yield back.

961 *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield? Will the 962 gentleman yield?

963 Thank you. I remember in the 1990s, I was up in

Abilene, north of Abilene, Texas, energy producing area, but 964 965 at that time wasn't really known for the energy that was produced. As we quail-hunted through the area, I saw the 966 967 natural -- the pipelines from the oil well production. We got to talking about energy. The gentleman I was hunting 968 with started talking about the oil that was trapped in the 969 shale. He picked up a piece of shale, and cracked it open, 970 and sat it on a flat rock in the sun. And he said, "We are 971 972 going to hunt around, and we are going to come back by this area, and I want you to look at this rock when we come back 973 bv.'` 974

We came back by an hour-and-a-half, two hours later. The shale had been sitting in the sunshine. Oil was leaking out of it, oil trapped in that shale. That is what the hydraulic fracturing does, is it releases the oil in the shale, holds that frac open so that oil can flow and be pumped to the surface to be produced. That is what it is. It is pretty simple.

But I thank the gentleman for pointing out that field hearings are important. I want to thank the ranking member for letting us know why they didn't attend. And I want to encourage this committee, under our chairman, to continue

986	doing more field hearings to educate us on both sides of the
987	aisle on issues that are important to the Energy Subcommittee
988	and to the Energy and Commerce full committee.
989	And with that, I will yield back to the gentleman, who
990	yields back, and
991	*Mr. Cardenas. Mr. Pfluger, will you yield for the last
992	few seconds?
993	*Mr. Pfluger. Sure.
994	*Mr. Duncan. The time, Mr. Pfluger
995	*Mr. Cardenas. Mr. Pfluger, will you yield?
996	*Mr. Pfluger. Yes, sir.
997	*Mr. Cardenas. Thank you so much. And by the way, you
998	were a gracious host, and I enjoyed going to Midland as one
999	of the few Democratic members that was able to clear his
1000	calendar at the last minute and make it.
1001	And I just wanted to let you know that that wasn't the
1002	I am sorry, but that wasn't the first time I went to
1003	Midland. The first time I went to Midland, I went all the
1004	way out there, a couple of plane flights, and then in a
1005	vehicle, et cetera, for a couple hours and went out to an
1006	actual rig, and actually got the workers there to explain to
1007	me what it was like working there, et cetera. So I

1008	personally do appreciate the opportunity that it is, as an
1009	economic engine for that community.
1010	But also, I think that what we should be talking about
1011	in Congress is not only appetite, but responsibility in how
1012	we move forward.
1013	So thank you so much. Thank you for yielding.
1014	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time has expired. Any
1015	other members seeking recognition?
1016	Ms. Castor from Florida is recognized. For what purpose
1017	do you seek recognition?
1018	*Ms. Castor. To speak in opposition to the bill and to
1019	strike the last word.
1020	*Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognized.
1021	*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Protecting
1022	American Energy Production Act does not protect American
1023	interests. It does not protect the pocketbooks of the
1024	American people. It protects the profits of Big Oil and Gas.
1025	Big Oil and Gas, they are already making the largest profits
1026	in history.
1027	And it is clear now that, as gas prices spiked last year
1028	after Putin's invasion of Ukraine, oil and gas companies

49

could have lowered the price at the pump. They could have

1030 lowered electricity bills. We were in a time of crisis. We 1031 still are supporting our brothers and sisters in Ukraine from 1032 Putin's unprovoked invasion. But instead, they made a 1033 decision to gouge consumers.

1034 So that is why it is hard to look at the whole range of 1035 bills here today and say, gosh, this is really good news for 1036 American consumers, because it is not. It is really good 1037 news for the Big Oil CEOs and their shareholders. These 1038 bills would keep American consumers and businesses tied to 1039 volatile oil and gas prices over time. It does nothing to 1040 expand on cleaner, cheaper energy.

1041 What will lower cost and create jobs, help us build 1042 safer communities, healthier communities across America? 1043 That will be clean energy.

1044 What do we know about hydraulic fracking, hydraulic fracturing? There are many places across the country where 1045 it should not be happening. Often times, fracking poisons 1046 the water, it contaminates the air, especially if you are in 1047 1048 proximity to the fracking operations. Proximity to fracking is associated with congenital heart defects, increased high 1049 risk of high-risk pregnancy and premature birth, worsening 1050 asthma, and increased rates of hospitalization for cardiac, 1051

1052 neurological, and cancer-related problems.

1053 When you are talking about fracking, you are also talking about methane. Methane accelerates the costly 1054 1055 climate crisis. It is a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide over its first 100 years in the atmosphere, 1056 more -- fully, 86 times more potent over its first 20 years. 1057 Methane has been found to leak from fracking wells, 1058 equipment, and pipelines at rates that make it worse for the 1059 1060 environment even than coal. Those leakage rates, if 1061 sustained, move us all the more closer to climate catastrophes. 1062

We are already suffering through higher costs across the 1063 board, driven by the warming planet. And when you double 1064 down here on fossil fuels, making it easier to drill and 1065 frack, and lifting the environmental and health safeguards, 1066 what you are saying to the American people and to businesses 1067 is, "Here is a bill, here is a higher bill, a higher-cost 1068 bill. You are going to have to pay for everything caused by 1069 1070 climate change: drought, crop collapse, property insurance, just plain insurance back home because of the escalating 1071 risks of the climate crisis.' ` 1072

1073 What should we be doing is building on clean energy

resources. Clean energy is cheaper energy. And thank 1074 goodness that we have passed the Inflation Reduction Act that 1075 will help deploy cleaner, cheaper energy faster, and it will 1076 1077 help lower energy bills for American families and businesses. For example, significant tax credits for solar energy, 1078 microgrid technology, expanded ITC, eligibility for 1079 interconnection cost, and wind and solar. In fact, in the 1080 months following President Biden's signing of the Inflation 1081 1082 Reduction Act, we have seen about \$40 billion of investment across America in clean energy projects. And many of these 1083 projects are going into Republican states, red states. 1084 That is great. But this is how we are going to build energy 1085 security for the American people. It is how we are going to 1086 1087 build a healthier society, not doubling down and giving away freebies to Big Oil and Gas. 1088

1089 So I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and really 1090 turn a critical eye to a lot of these giveaways to Big Oil 1091 and Gas that we will be debating today.

1092 I yield back.

Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. For what purpose does the gentlelady from Washington seek recognition? The Chair. To strike the last word.

Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognizes.
*The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am reflecting
on a congressional delegation led by former Chairman Fred
Upton from this committee when we went to Europe back in the
spring of 2015, in May of 2015, and several of the members on
the committee were visiting in Europe at that time.

Putin had taken Crimea the previous year. That winter 1102 he had turned off natural gas pipelines into Ukraine, and 1103 1104 Ukraine was begging us for more natural gas. They had -- and we were inspired by their fight for independence and 1105 self-determination. And I was reminded -- and we saw 1106 firsthand -- how important energy was to that fight for 1107 independence and self-determination, and having energy from 1108 1109 their partners, and allies not being dependent upon Putin.

It was also on that trip that we met with the NATO 1110 general who explained to us that Putin was the one funding 1111 the NGOs in Europe that were anti-fracking, new technology 1112 from the United States of America that had unleashed American 1113 1114 gas, the shale revolution. It was extraordinary. And we were celebrating in the United States of America that had 1115 brought down the cost of natural gas. It had actually been 1116 the driver in leading us in reducing carbon emissions. 1117

Natural gas is -- probably one of the best things that 1118 we could do for the world is to unleash natural gas. And 1119 Putin was educating the Europeans as to the dangers of 1120 1121 fracking. Yes, don't do fracking. And they didn't. And he was funding the NGOs that were educating the Europeans. 1122 So they didn't do fracking. And instead, Europe remained 1123 dependent upon Putin. Russia -- or -- and Ukraine needed the 1124 Russian natural gas. 1125

I share this because this is so important. This legislation is very important. This is a key part of American energy that is so important to our economy, our national security, American leadership, and supporting our allies around the world. And I am proud to support it. And I wanted to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

1132 *Mr. Pfluger. I thank the chairman.

I was in Florida's 14th district on Tuesday of last week, which is Tampa Bay, and the port director and many of the folks that were there mentioned how grateful they were because 45 percent of Florida's oil and gas comes through Tampa Bay, through the Port of Tampa Bay. And I think the residents of Florida -- and I forget the exact population, 20 million maybe -- are very grateful for the fact that they

have this energy that comes through. That is all coming from Port Arthur and Corpus Christi, Houston, Louisiana. Those products are flowing through.

1143 And I would like to push back on the fact that hydraulic fracturing is poisonous to human beings, that it is poisonous 1144 to the earth, that the chemicals that are used in it and in 1145 these -- and I would like to invite my colleague who has said 1146 that to come and see the hydraulic fracturing, to actually 1147 taste the chemicals that are used to mix with water and sand, 1148 because you can do that, because they are that safe. And so 1149 this notion that they are actually poisoning humans or 1150 causing congenital heart failure is false. It is not true. 1151

There was a quote recently that said Exxon made more 1152 1153 money than God, but not near as much as Apple. That was from the President of the United States, from President Biden. 1154 And on April 20th of 2020, I don't see -- didn't see the 1155 outcry at oil going to -30-plus dollars a barrel, but it did. 1156 And yet they have survived. And the reinvestment into this 1157 1158 industry has not happened because of the ESG environment that we face, which I am certain that we will get to. 1159

1160 I think I would, at this point, yield to my friend from 1161 North Dakota.

Mr. Armstrong. We -- thank you, Madam Chair. And, you know, we talk a lot about this, and it is cheaper and more reliable.

I just have to point out again everything is cheaper and more reliable if you give it grants, subsidies, and tax credits. We have created a Federal tax structure in which you can sell an electron onto the grid from a renewable source for less than it costs to produce. Everything is cheaper if you throw billions and billions of Federal dollars at it.

And when you are talking about places where I live and where my constituents live as some kind of toxic environment, I think we should do another field hearing. I think we should go to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and look at a cobalt mine. Let's go drink downstream from a Malaysian lithium mine, and talk about what is and isn't clean energy.

1178 And with that, I yield back.

1179 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady's time has expired. Any 1180 other members seeking recognition?

Mr. Curtis, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Curtis. To strike the last word.

1183 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.

*Mr. Curtis. Thank you. I would like to take just a minute to address the comments that we heard from my colleague from Florida. And if I heard correctly, the comment was that we are doing this because we want to help Big Oil.

And the first thing I have to ask myself, like, who is 1189 Big Oil? I am not sure exactly, but we hear that term thrown 1190 around all the time. It feels to me that it is part of the 1191 1192 demonization of the many good men and women in large and small corporations around the world that, for decades and 1193 decades, have contributed to our quality of life and our 1194 ability to stay warm in the winter and cold in the summer. 1195 Ι know personally in my district they don't see themselves as 1196 1197 Big Oil. They see themselves as contributing to the productivity of this country. 1198

I would advocate that our purpose for the bills this morning is not to help Big Oil -- I don't know any of us that really care about that -- but it is to avoid what has happened in Europe. And you have heard that alluded to here this morning. A year ago I found myself in Europe several days before the war broke out, and while the war was breaking out, and several days after the war broke out. And I heard

some of the things that have been referred to today. 1206 1207 You know, just 15 years ago Europe produced as much natural gas as Russia. Just 15 years ago. And they decided 1208 1209 that they weren't going to frack. So today they buy fracked natural gas from Russia. They are dependent on their enemy 1210 for fuel. They have an unstable, unreliable source. 1211 Thev are paying exorbitant amounts for that fuel. And I can't 1212 speak for all my colleagues, but that is why I am supporting 1213 1214 these bills today. I want to make sure that we don't go down a path that is -- that robs us of our energy independence, 1215 that robs us of affordable, reliable power and, at the end of 1216 the day, like Europe, produces more greenhouse gas emissions 1217 than before they started down this road. 1218 1219 I think I speak for me and my colleagues that we want to be reliable, we want to be affordable, and we want to be 1220 clean. And that is the intent of our bills today. 1221

1222 And with that, I yield back my time.

1223 *Mr. Duncan. Any other members seeking recognition?
1224 The gentleman from Alabama, for what purpose do you seek
1225 recognition?

Mr. Palmer. I would like to speak in support of the bill, and I move to strike the last word.

1228 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.

*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been in so many of these hearings, and I keep hearing people talk about the -- what the existential threat is. I just want to let you know that I think the policies of this Administration have become an existential threat not only to our economic security, but to our national security.

1235 The war in Ukraine did not create the energy crisis, 1236 despite what some of our colleagues might believe. It 1237 exposed it.

To my colleague from Utah's points there, 15 years ago 1238 Europe was producing as much natural gas as Russia was. But 1239 over the last decade, decade and a half, they have allowed 1240 1241 their hydrocarbon infrastructure to go into decline. Todav Germany's electricity prices are three or four times higher 1242 than they are here. In the UK, energy consumption by --1243 residential energy consumption has declined by 10 percent, 1244 not because they have become more efficient, Mr. Chairman, 1245 1246 but because they can't afford it. That is where this country 1247 is heading.

1248 There are four things that the modern world depends on: 1249 cement, steel, plastic, and fertilizer. Natural gas is

essential to all four; 80 percent of ammonia nitrate -- of the cost of ammonium nitrate fertilizer, which we depend on to produce our food, is natural gas.

1253 It is a national security issue to be taking down our hydrocarbon infrastructure. China is building a coal-fired 1254 plant 1 about every 2 weeks, but they have built 14 outside 1255 of China. They are bringing power to sub-Saharan African 1256 countries. They are moving into Latin America, and we are 1257 1258 letting it happen. And we are sitting here with this ESG mentality, this attitude that we are going to go completely 1259 renewable. And from an engineering and technological 1260 perspective, it will not happen. We are undermining our own 1261 national security and the national security of the Western 1262 1263 Hemisphere by doing this.

1264 I applaud you for bringing this bill. We need to secure our hydrocarbon infrastructure. We are not depending on any 1265 other nation for our energy security. We have it right here. 1266 But if we go to 100 percent renewables, we will be dependent 1267 1268 on China. And if there is anything that we can learn from the war in Ukraine, it is that no nation should be dependent 1269 on an adversarial nation for its energy supply. It becomes a 1270 massive national security issue. 1271

1272 And I will yield back.

1273 *Mr. Johnson. Will the gentleman yield?

1274 *Mr. Palmer. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding. You know, we set out in this session to find common-sense solutions to address the energy crisis that we have. And I think a good faith effort is being made to seek bipartisan solutions in that effort.

1280 But I tell you, when we have members that make absurd allegations that hydraulic fracturing contaminates the water 1281 table when, in fact, there hasn't been an EPA administrator 1282 since the Obama Administration that has agreed with that --1283 in fact, they said there is no proof that hydraulic 1284 1285 fracturing contaminates the water, it is right the opposite. 1286 It has proven very safe, and has been for a very long time. I would just urge my colleagues, if we want to have 1287 substantive, bipartisan negotiations to come to bipartisan 1288 solutions to address both energy and climate issues, then we 1289 1290 need to be willing to sit down and have an honest conversation, and stop acting like environmental activists in 1291 the process. 1292

1293 And with that, I yield back.

*Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, I will just conclude with this. We keep hearing what the science says, and the science that I am reading is different from what I am hearing. What I am hearing is political science.

I just want to point out since 1970, because of natural gas, our carbon dioxide emissions have gone down 32 percent. We have also reduced the emissions of the 6 criteria gases that the EPA tracks by 86 percent, even though our economy has grown by 142 percent. We are on the right track with the changes we are making, and the use of hydrocarbons, and we should stay on that track.

1305 With that, Mr. Chairman, unless someone wants the last 1306 10 seconds, I yield back.

1307 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any other 1308 members seeking recognition?

1309 Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding H.R.1310 1121 to the full committee.

1311 All those in favor, say aye.

1312 Opposed, no.

1313 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it.

1314 *Voice. Request a recorded vote, please.

1315 *Mr. Duncan. A recorded vote has been requested. The

1316	clerk will call the roll.
1317	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
1318	*Mr. Burgess. [Inaudible.]
1319	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes aye.
1320	Rep. Latta?
1321	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
1322	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
1323	Rep. Guthrie?
1324	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
1325	*The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes aye.
1326	Rep. Griffith?
1327	[No response.]
1328	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
1329	*Mr. Johnson. Aye, votes aye.
1330	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
1331	Rep. Bucshon?
1332	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
1333	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
1334	Rep. Walberg?
1335	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
1000	
1336	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.

1338	*Mr. Palmer. Aye.
1339	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes aye.
1340	Rep. Curtis?
1341	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
1342	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.
1343	Rep. Lesko?
1344	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
1345	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
1346	Rep. Pence?
1347	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
1348	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong?
1349	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
1350	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes aye.
1351	Rep. Weber?
1352	*Mr. Weber. Aye.
1353	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes aye.
1354	Rep. Balderson?
1355	*Mr. Balderson. Yes.
1356	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.
1357	Rep. Pfluger?
1358	*Mr. Pfluger. Aye.
1359	*The Clerk. Rep. Pfluger votes aye.
	64

1360	Rep. Rodgers?
1361	*The Chair. [Inaudible.]
1362	*The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes aye.
1363	Rep. Duncan?
1364	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
1365	*The Clerk. Rep. Duncan votes aye.
1366	Rep. DeGette?
1367	*Ms. DeGette. No.
1368	*The Clerk. Rep. DeGette votes no.
1369	Rep. Peters?
1370	*Mr. Peters. [Inaudible.]
1371	*The Clerk. Rep. Peters votes no.
1372	Rep. Fletcher?
1373	[No response.]
1374	*The Clerk. Rep. Matsui?
1375	*Ms. Matsui. No.
1376	*The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes no.
1377	Rep. Tonko?
1378	*Mr. Tonko. No.
1379	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes no.
1380	Rep. Veasey?
1381	*Mr. Veasey. No.

1382	*The Clerk. Rep. Veasey votes no.
1383	Rep. Kuster?
1384	*Ms. Kuster. [Inaudible.]
1385	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.
1386	Rep. Schrier?
1387	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
1388	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.
1389	Rep. Castor?
1390	*Ms. Castor. No.
1391	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.
1392	Rep. Sarbanes?
1393	[No response.]
1394	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
1395	*Mr. Cardenas. [Inaudible.]
1396	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.
1397	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
1398	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. [Inaudible.]
1399	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes no.
1400	Rep. Pallone?
1401	*Mr. Pallone. No.
1402	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.
1403	*Mr. Pence. Mr. Chair, how am I recorded?

1404	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Pence recorded?
1405	*The Clerk. Mr. Pence is not recorded.
1406	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
1407	*The Clerk. Mr. Pence votes aye.
1408	*Mr. Duncan. Any member wishing to change their vote?
1409	The clerk will report the total.
1410	[Pause.]
1411	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 16 ayes
1412	and 11 noes.
1413	*Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill is agreed
1414	to. The chair will now call up H.R. 1085, and ask the clerk
1415	to report the bill.
1416	*The Clerk. H.R. 1085, to require the Secretary of
1417	Energy to direct the National Petroleum Council to issue a
1418	report with respect to petrochemical refineries in the United
1419	States, and for other purposes.
1420	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
1421	the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for
1422	amendment any point.
1423	So ordered.
1424	[The bill follows:]
1425	

1426 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

*Mr. Duncan. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the 1428 1429 bill? Any other amendments to the bill? 1430 1431 The chair will now recognize the author of the bill, Mr. Latta, to discuss the bill for five minutes. 1432 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to 1433 strike the last word. 1434 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized. 1435 1436 *Mr. Latta. Thank you very much for holding this markup today, and I am proud to offer H.R. 1085, the REFINE Act, 1437 which aims to help address the problems we are facing when it 1438 comes to boosting petrochemical refining capacity in our 1439 1440 nation. In the last three years, North America has lost over a 1441 million barrels of fuel per day in refining capacity. At the 1442 same time, demand for energy has skyrocketed. This has 1443 stretched our refining -- refineries thin, and forced them to 1444 run at close to 95 percent of total capacity. We need to 1445 1446 ensure refining capacity can keep up with the demand, and keep prices affordable for all Americans. 1447 The REFINER Act would direct the National Petroleum 1448

69

Council to examine the importance of petrochemical refineries

to energy security, and issue a report that contains an 1450 1451 analysis of these refineries and opportunities to expand that capacity. 1452 1453 This legislation will give us the blueprint we need to reverse our nation's losses in the refining industry, and 1454 restore our ability to meet the energy needs of the American 1455 people. 1456 I urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 1085 and, Mr. 1457 1458 Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. *Mr. Duncan. Any further discussion on the bill? 1459 Mr. Pence, for what purpose do you seek recognition? 1460 *Mr. Pence. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last 1461 1462 word. 1463 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I urge my 1464 *Mr. Pence. colleagues to support H.R. 1085, the REFINER Act, which I 1465 cosponsored with Congressman Latta. 1466 Petroleum is the lifeblood of the U.S. economy. Whether 1467 1468 it is for manufacturing facilities, trucking industry, or our farmers, petrochemicals are the bedrock of Indiana's economic 1469 growth. Refineries across the country have repeatedly told 1470 Congress and the Administration that they are already 1471 70

1472 reaching maximum capacity.

1473 Instead of alleviating these pressures, lower prices for hardworking Americans, the Biden Administration is slapping 1474 1475 regulations onto oil and gas companies and deterring necessary investment. The President falsely blames the 1476 petroleum industry for high energy prices facing Hoosiers and 1477 all Americans. After two long years, it has become clear 1478 that the find-and-fine approach of this Administration is 1479 1480 wrong for Hoosier communities, and puts Americans at risk. The REFINER Act is a critical step to putting our nation 1481 back on track to a reliable, affordable, and secure energy 1482 future. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill, and I 1483 yield back. 1484

1485 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any further 1486 discussion on the bill?

1487 Seeing none, the chair -- the question now occurs on 1488 forwarding H.R. 1085 to the full committee.

1489 All those in favor, say aye.

1490 Opposed, no.

1491 *Mr. Latta. Mr. Chairman? If we could have a roll call 1492 vote --

1493 *Mr. Duncan. In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have

1494	it.
1495	*Mr. Latta Mr. Chairman.
1496	*Mr. Duncan. Asked for a roll call vote?
1497	*Mr. Latta. A roll call.
1498	*Mr. Duncan. A roll call vote has been requested. The
1499	clerk will report the will call the roll.
1500	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
1501	*Mr. Burgess. [Inaudible.]
1502	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes aye.
1503	Rep. Latta?
1504	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
1505	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
1506	Rep. Guthrie?
1507	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
1508	*The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes aye.
1509	Rep. Griffith?
1510	[No response.]
1511	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
1512	[No response.]
1513	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon?
1514	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
1515	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
1516	Rep. Walberg?
------	---------------------------------------
1517	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
1518	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.
1519	Rep. Palmer?
1520	[No response.]
1521	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis?
1522	*Mr. Curtis. [Inaudible.]
1523	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.
1524	Rep. Lesko?
1525	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
1526	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
1527	Rep. Pence?
1528	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
1529	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.
1530	Rep. Armstrong?
1531	[No response.]
1532	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber?
1533	*Mr. Weber. Aye.
1534	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes aye.
1535	Rep. Balderson?
1536	*Mr. Balderson. Aye.
1537	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.

1538	Rep.	Pfluger?
1539	*Mr.	Pfluger. Aye.
1540	*The	Clerk. Rep. Pfluger votes aye.
1541	Rep.	Rodgers?
1542	*The	Chair. Aye.
1543	*The	Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes aye.
1544	Rep.	Duncan?
1545	*Mr.	Duncan. [Inaudible.]
1546	*The	Clerk. Rep. Duncan votes aye.
1547	Rep.	DeGette?
1548	*Ms.	DeGette. [Inaudible.]
1549	*The	Clerk. Rep. DeGette votes no.
1550	Rep.	Peters?
1551	*Mr.	Peters. [Inaudible.]
1552	*The	Clerk. Rep. Peters votes no.
1553	Rep.	Fletcher?
1554	[No 1	cesponse.]
1555	*The	Clerk. Rep. Matsui?
1556	*Ms.	Matsui. No.
1557	*The	Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes no.
1558	Rep.	Tonko?
1559	*Mr.	Tonko. No.

1560	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes no.
1561	Rep. Veasey?
1562	*Mr. Veasey. [Inaudible.]
1563	*The Clerk. Rep. Veasey votes no.
1564	Rep. Kuster?
1565	*Ms. Kuster. [Inaudible.]
1566	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.
1567	Rep. Schrier?
1568	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
1569	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.
1570	Rep. Castor?
1571	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]
1572	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.
1573	Rep. Sarbanes?
1574	[No response.]
1575	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
1576	*Mr. Cardenas. No.
1577	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.
1578	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
1579	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. No.
1580	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes no.
1581	Rep. Pallone?

1582 *	Mr. Pallone. [Inaudible.]
1583 *	The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.
1584 *	Mr. Duncan. Have all members voted?
1585 *	Mrs. Fletcher. Mr. Chairman?
1586 *	Mr. Johnson. Johnson.
1587 *	Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Johnson
1588 *	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson is not recorded.
1589 *	Mr. Johnson. Johnson votes aye.
1590 *	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
1591 *	Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Palmer recorded?
1592 *	The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.
1593 *	Mr. Palmer. Aye.
1594 *	The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.
1595 *	Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Armstrong reported?
1596 *	The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong is not recorded.
1597 *	Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
1598 *	The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong votes aye.
1599 *	Mr. Duncan. How is Mrs. Fletcher?
1600 *	The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher is not recorded.
1601 *	Mrs. Fletcher. Fletcher votes yes.
1602 *	The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.
1603 *	Mr. Duncan. Have all members voted?

1604 The clerk will report the total.

1605 [Pause.]

1606 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 17 ayes 1607 and 11 noes.

1608 *Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill is agreed 1609 to.

1610 The chair will next call up H.R. 1058, and ask the clerk 1611 to report the bill.

1612 *The Clerk. H.R. 1058, to establish a more uniform, 1613 transparent, and modern process to authorize the 1614 construction, connection, and operation and maintenance of 1615 international border crossing facilities for the import and 1616 export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of

1617 electricity.

1618 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of 1619 the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for 1620 amendment any time.

So ordered.

1622 [The bill follows:]

- 1623
- 1624 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

1625

*Mr. Duncan. The chair will recognize Mr. Armstrong for 1626 -- the sponsor of the bill -- for five minutes. 1627 *Mr. Armstrong. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have seen 1628 1629 firsthand the consequences of having a cross-border infrastructure approval process that is not dependable for 1630 projects which take years to complete from conception to 1631 operation: capital is chased out of the market, 1632 infrastructure is strained, and we have supply chain 1633 1634 bottlenecks that hamper our economy. The Promoting Cross-border Energy Infrastructure Act 1635 would create a uniform and transparent process for the 1636 construction, connection, and operation of international 1637 energy border-crossing facilities by replacing the existing 1638 1639 presidential permit structure with a straightforward and understandable statutory process. 1640

1641 H.R. 1058 would authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory 1642 Commission to review applications for cross-border oil and 1643 natural gas pipelines, and similarly authorize the Department 1644 of Energy to review applications for cross-border electric 1645 transmission facilities.

1646 The committee has a long history with the Promoting 1647 Cross-border Energy Infrastructure Act. Similar versions of

this bill have been subject to committee hearings, markups, and passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support. This committee has heard testimony from FERC, stakeholders, and expert witnesses about the implementation and benefit associated with this bill.

1653 That said, I want to again point out what this bill does 1654 not do. This bill has nothing in it that would repeal the 1655 applicable environmental protection status -- statutes 1656 governing pipeline approvals. Again, nothing in this bill 1657 addresses environmental reviews.

Additionally, the bill does not impact the ability of states or Federal agencies to carry out their statutory responsibilities for energy infrastructure deployment.

I urge a yes vote on the Promoting Cross-border Energy Infrastructure Act because we need to streamline the approval process and implement reasonable timelines for our consideration, and I yield back.

1665 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any further 1666 discussion?

1667 Mr. Pallone from New Jersey is recognized.

1668 *Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last 1669 word.

1670 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.
1671 *Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to
1672 H.R. 1058, the Promoting Cross-border Energy Infrastructure
1673 Act.

This bill would overhaul the presidential permit process for cross-border oil and natural gas pipelines, along with transmission wires, and create a presumption that any crossborder energy transmission is in the public interest.

1678 It would also resurrect the specter of Keystone pipeline, which has been dead for nearly two years now. 1679 When Republicans brought this bill up the last time they were in 1680 power, they made no effort to hide the linkage between the 1681 pipeline and this bill, nor do they do so now. This bill 1682 1683 would provide a process for that project -- that is Keystone -- to once again rise from the dead and seek a certificate to 1684 once again threaten hundreds of communities across the nation 1685 with dangerous oil spills and contaminated water. 1686

But even setting aside Keystone, this bill is bad policy. It asks FERC and the Department of Energy to forego their traditional consultations with the Departments of State and Defense, and instead step far outside their bounds as energy regulators and involve themselves in international

affairs. It asks FERC to site oil pipelines and activity the 1692 agency has never had control over without any additional 1693 resources to build the staff capacity for how to do that. 1694 1695 The bill is also, frankly, unclear. It is unclear about what length of a pipeline or transmission line these new 1696 certificates of crossing it creates would apply to. 1697 Ιt creates contradictory deadlines for approving natural gas 1698 imports and exports to and from Canada and Mexico, in one 1699 1700 section saying an application must be approved within 30 days, an impossible deadline to meet, and in another saying 1701 that an agency must take action 120 days after the NEPA 1702 review has concluded. 1703

And these are not new issues. This bill was marked up in this subcommittee six years ago, and Democrats raised some of these same concerns then. They were ignored, and the bill before us today is nearly identical to the one that came before us back then. And the previous version of the bill passed the House, but only to die in the Senate. And I think this bill is destined to suffer the same fate.

I don't know why our Republican majority insists on using valuable committee time to push ideas that didn't even have a chance when Republicans controlled the House and the

1714	Senate and the presidency. So I don't think this is serious.
1715	And with that, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill,
1716	and I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.
1717	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. For what
1718	purpose does Mr. Walberg seek recognition?
1719	*Mr. Walberg. I have an amendment at the desk.
1720	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman has an amendment at the
1721	desk. The clerk will report the amendment.
1722	*The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1058, offered by Rep.
1723	Walberg. Page eight, after line three, insert the following:
1724	Prohibition on revocation of presidential permits.
1725	Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the president may
1726	not revoke a presidential permit or similar permit issued
1727	pursuant to executive order number 13337, executive order
1728	number 11423, executive order number 12038, executive order
1729	number 10485, or any other executive order for the
1730	construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil
1731	or natural gas pipeline, or electric transmission facility,
1732	or any border crossing facility thereof, unless such
1733	revocation is authorized by an act of Congress.
1734	[The amendment of Mr. Walberg follows:]
1735	

1736 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

1738 *Mr. Duncan. Mr. Walberg is recognized to explain his 1739 amendment.

*Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment
would add complementary language from my legislation, H.R.
1197, the Protecting International Pipelines for Energy
Security, or PIPES, Act.

The amendment prohibits the president from revoking any 1744 presidential permit or authorization for the construction, 1745 1746 operation, or maintenance of an oil, natural gas pipeline, electric transmission facility, or any cross-border facility. 1747 Our energy and national security should not be subject 1748 to the whims of the executive branch. We saw the 1749 consequences of this in 2021, when President Biden 1750 1751 unilaterally revoked a permit for the Keystone XL pipeline, halting the \$9 billion project that was meant to carry 1752 830,000 barrels per day of crude oil from Canada to the 1753 United States. 1754

The same year, there were reports that the President was considering shutting down Line 5 in Michigan, which carries 540,000 barrels per day of light crude oil and natural gas that heats homes, powers businesses, and fills up vehicles across the Midwest.

Remember, this doesn't mean that the crude oil and 1760 1761 natural gas are not being brought into the United States, but rather, they must travel by rail or truck, which are both 1762 1763 more expensive, slower, and less safe -- even as we have seen in Ohio just recently, tragically -- than pipelines. 1764 If this was really about protecting the environment and lowering 1765 costs, the Biden Administration would be working with us to 1766 modernize existing pipelines and build new ones. 1767

Thankfully, the legislation offered by my friend, Mr. Armstrong, will actually help us accomplish this by establishing a more uniform and transparent process to authorize construction and maintenance of cross-border energy facilities. It rightfully takes the approval power away from the politics of presidential permits, and gives it to FERC and DoE.

1775 My amendment would place revocation power only with 1776 Congress. Together, our two bills ensure that who sits in 1777 the White House doesn't hinder America's energy security. 1778 I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment and

1779 the underlying bill, and I yield back.

1780 *Mr. Latta. Will the gentleman yield?

1781 *Mr. Walberg. I yield.

1782 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you. I appreciate my friend 1783 from Michigan's amendment.

When talking about Line 5, I think it is really important, because this is a line that not only benefits Canada and Michigan, but also Ohio. And I think, as I remember when we were talking about Line 5 in the past, one of the things, if we did not have Line 5, it would take about 2,200 truckloads a day to move that same product, which we don't have. And we know that the pipeline is safer.

1791 So I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I yield 1792 back to the gentleman.

1793 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back?

*Mr. Walberg. I would be -- yield to -- I would be glad
to yield to my colleague from North Dakota, Mr. Armstrong.
*Mr. Armstrong. Thank you, Mr. Walberg, for offering
this amendment to my bill, because the -- preventing the
president from undermining existing permits is essential for
providing long-term regulatory certainty needed by energy
infrastructure developers.

1801 This amendment provides clarity for projects that are 1802 already operating or approved under the presidential permit 1803 structure, and complements the underlying text of the bill,

and I appreciate the amendment. 1804 *Mr. Walberg. I thank the gentleman. And unless 1805 anybody else wants it, I yield back. 1806 1807 *Mr. Duncan. I think Mr. Weber wants some. *Mr. Weber. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last 1808 1809 words. *Mr. Duncan. We are going to hold that thought. 1810 I will go to Mr. Cardenas first. 1811 1812 *Mr. Cardenas. I move to strike the last word on the amendment, Mr. Chairman. 1813 *Mr. Duncan. -- recognized. 1814 *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you so much. Mr. Chairman, I 1815 speak in opposition to this amendment. 1816 1817 This amendment is nothing more than an attempt to bring back a pipeline project, a pipeline project whose very 1818 investors have declared completely dead for nearly two years 1819 1820 now. Let's dispense with everything else and be clear. 1821 This 1822 amendment is a pro-Keystone XL pipeline amendment. But it is also worse than just that. This amendment would freeze in 1823 place any cross-border energy infrastructure that ever 1824 received a presidential permit over the last 50 years. 1825 The

1826	agencies would not have the authority to revoke or amend the
1827	permits. The president would not have the authority to
1828	revoke or amend the permits. Any project, no matter how
1829	mistaken, no matter how misguided, no matter how many issues
1830	had come up since its permit was issued, would be allowed to
1831	operate in perpetuity without agency review.
1832	This amendment represents a brazen handout to Big Oil
1833	and Gas at the cost of American border communities across our
1834	country. It is a retroactive lottery ticket to any company
1835	that received a presidential permit over the last 50 years.
1836	And with that I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield
1837	back.
1837 1838	back. [Pause.]
1838	[Pause.]
1838 1839	[Pause.] *Mr. Cardenas. Okay, I yield back.
1838 1839 1840	[Pause.] *Mr. Cardenas. Okay, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.
1838 1839 1840 1841	[Pause.] *Mr. Cardenas. Okay, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. The chair for what purpose does Mr. Weber seek
1838 1839 1840 1841 1842	<pre>[Pause.] *Mr. Cardenas. Okay, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. The chair for what purpose does Mr. Weber seek recognition?</pre>
1838 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843	<pre>[Pause.] *Mr. Cardenas. Okay, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. The chair for what purpose does Mr. Weber seek recognition? *Mr. Weber. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.</pre>
1838 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843 1844	<pre>[Pause.] *Mr. Cardenas. Okay, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. The chair for what purpose does Mr. Weber seek recognition? *Mr. Weber. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.</pre>

1848 all the oil spills, to quote -- almost quote one of the 1849 comments I have heard today.

1850 Keystone pipeline comes into my district. It carries 1851 830,000 barrels of oil a day. Representative Latta had a 1852 great bill. He ended -- he pointed out that we were a 1853 million barrels a day down in oil for refining. That one 1854 pipeline would cover 80 percent of the need.

And all this rhetoric about pipelines are dangerous, 1855 1856 look it up for yourself. The pipeline industry has a 99.99something safety rating. You don't get that from the rail. 1857 You don't get that from trucking. It is the safest way to 1858 move product. It is about energy security, it is about 1859 national security, it is about economic security, it is about 1860 1861 jobs for people, and making sure that America remains foremost the safest and most viable country in the world, 1862 especially if it ever comes to a war that we need energy for. 1863 So I would urge all of our colleagues to support this 1864 amendment, and I will yield to my friend from North Dakota. 1865 1866 *Mr. Armstrong. Thank you. And while not speaking for anybody else on this side of the aisle, I think this is a 1867 perfect example of the different governing viewpoints. 1868 I probably understand the onshore oil and gas industry 1869

as well as anybody in Congress. And I know full well we 1870 can't resurrect a pipeline. It is a northern border 1871 expansion of an existing pipeline that only one company can 1872 1873 build. Republicans in Congress can't build it. Democrats in Congress can't build it. The government shouldn't build it. 1874 But this isn't the only project with our closest ally 1875 that is existing and wanting to be built. And the reality 1876 is, by dealing with this in something that takes 10 to 12 1877 1878 years to come to completion -- it should be clear, too, there was nothing unique about the Keystone XL pipeline, other than 1879 it was probably the most vetted pipeline in the history of 1880 the country. The uniqueness to it is it is the only one the 1881 President could shut down with a stroke of a pen, the only 1882 1883 one. And that is what happened. And that project is over, and that is up to a particular company if they choose to 1884 resurrect that, if the law and the policy exists in a place 1885 where they would like it to be. 1886

But there are a lot of different projects with our allies to the north. I border them for the entire northern border of my state. There are our closest ally, there are our best friend. It is old school Monroe Doctrine, and it takes us from using somebody who we have never been at war

with, never been in a conflict with, and -- as opposed to our strategic ally -- or strategic adversaries on the world stage. So as we talk about this and we continue to move forward, the next bill has something to do with the Keystone XL. This has to do with being able to create a relationship with our closest ally to the north.

And anybody want to know why we don't want a public need 1898 determined project being determined by the Administration? 1899 1900 We can talk about the Keystone XL. Because on November 3rd of 2015, then-Secretary of State John Kerry determined that 1901 the Keystone XL project was not in the public interest 1902 because there was a perception among foreigners that the 1903 project would increase greenhouse gases, and that it didn't 1904 1905 matter whether that perception was actually accurate.

In Secretary Kerry's opinion, the decision would 1906 undercut the credibility of influence of the United States. 1907 Never mind that the project actually didn't increase 1908 greenhouse gases, never mind that Canadian drilling 1909 1910 requirements meet or exceed our own Federal requirements, never mind that it prioritized relationships with our 1911 strategic adversaries as our closest ally and neighbor. 1912 That is why we can't have nice things, and that is why 1913

1914	this bill is necessary. And that is why this bill is
1915	necessary for infrastructure projects now and in the future.
1916	And it actually doesn't resurrect the Keystone XL pipeline,
1917	because Republicans understand that the government is never
1918	going to build that.
1919	And with that, I yield back,
1920	*Mr. Walberg. Would the gentleman yield?
1921	*Mr. Armstrong. I would.
1922	*Mr. Walberg. I appreciate that. It is about Line 5,
1923	though, which is a project still in place. And right now the
1924	Canadian company has agreed to take the Line 5 and upgrade it
1925	by making a tunnel 200 feet under Lake Michigan, Lake Huron,
1926	the Mackinac Straits, a tunnel that will completely
1927	encapsulate Line 5, make it impossible to spill in the Great
1928	Lakes, and also make a way for communications cables, et
1929	cetera, to go through that same tunnel and to be manned and
1930	cared for. So they want to improve it.
1931	But this President, our governor, and others want to end
1932	Line 5. It is wrong. This bill will encourage expansion of
1933	better pipelines, safer pipelines. and more security for our
1934	country.

1935 I yield back.

The gentleman's time is expired. For what 1936 *Mr. Duncan. 1937 purpose does Mrs. Fletcher seek recognition? *Mrs. Fletcher. I move to strike the last word. 1938 1939 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognized. *Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 1940 Ι want to speak on the amendment, and then briefly on the 1941 underlying bill, as well, because on this amendment I agree 1942 that the revocation of the pipeline permit for the Keystone 1943 1944 pipeline was not the right decision. I said that at the I shared that view with the Administration. 1945 time. And the thing that I hear most from my constituents when 1946 it comes to these issues is that we need regulatory 1947 certainty; we need the ability to plan; we need to know, when 1948 1949 investing in multi-billion-dollar projects that take many, many years to construct, we need to be able to have a process 1950 and a system that works, that allows the planning to go on. 1951 And so I intend to support this amendment to the bill. And I 1952 think it is important to understand that. 1953 1954 But I also am frustrated that we are doing this sort of this way, because I think we need to tackle permitting reform 1955

1956 more broadly. That is something else that I have been

1957 working on. I was disappointed we couldn't get it done in

the last Congress. And certainly, I think it is really 1958 1959 important that we work together on both sides of the aisle. I think there is a lot of interest in permitting reform, and 1960 1961 I know that I have raised the issue many times. I think many people on this side of the aisle would like 1962 to work with you on permitting reform, and to make sure that 1963 we are doing that so we can do as -- what Mr. Armstrong said, 1964 streamline the process, create a process we can rely on for 1965 1966 all forms of energy infrastructure. It is hugely important. On the underlying bill here, I agree with so many of the 1967 points that Mr. Armstrong made, and I am not going to go back 1968 over all of them, but I do have some concerns about this 1969 bill. And in particular, as Mr. Armstrong just mentioned, 1970 the importance of having the input of the State Department, 1971 the geopolitics around energy production, the importance of 1972 the involvement of those with expertise about our national 1973 security. 1974

And what I see in this bill right now, as it is written, is really deferring those decisions, leaving out the Department of State, sending everything to the FERC. And I have some concerns about that. So I intend to vote no on the underlying bill at this time, and would love the opportunity

1980	to work with Mr. Armstrong and others to address some of
1981	these concerns about the bill as it moves forward, because I
1982	really do think that it is important that we work in a
1983	bipartisan way on this committee, on these issues.
1984	And if we can accomplish permitting reform in this
1985	Congress, it will be an incredible accomplishment that will
1986	help move our country forward on all forms of energy. I
1987	think that is something we all should agree on and,
1988	hopefully, we can accomplish in our committee.
1989	So with that, I yield back.
1990	*Mr. Pfluger. Will the gentlelady yield?
1991	*Mrs. Fletcher. Sure, I will yield to Mr. Pfluger.
1992	*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you for mentioning regulatory
1993	certainty. I couldn't agree with you more.
1994	It has been said in this hearing that Big Oil and I
1995	am still trying to figure out who that is, because I know
1996	individuals who are not, you know, in big companies that are
1997	doing this but it has been mentioned that Big Oil was
1998	gouging the American public. Regulatory certainty is the
1999	number-one reason that this industry is unable to reinvest,
2000	recapitalize, put more back into the system. And I think
2001	this particular bill by Mr. Armstrong and the amendment

2002 actually highlight that very well.

2003 And I couldn't agree with you more. I would love to work with you on permitting reform, because when we talk 2004 2005 about lowering the price, increasing the supply, making affordable, reliable energy actually come back into the 2006 system, it does revolve around the certainty. It is actually 2007 the lack of certainty. The only certainty we have right now 2008 is that this Administration is against the industry. That is 2009 2010 the only certainty that our industry knows.

And so therefore, every CEO that I talk to, every small 2011 business that is associated with the service, with the 2012 midstream and the E&P, or down to the refineries where your 2013 district is, they are 100 percent certain that the 2014 2015 Administration is against them. So this -- I think this bill highlights a very important factor and, hopefully, leads us 2016 into permitting reform, which is exactly where we need to go. 2017 I will yield back to you. 2018

2019 *Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Pfluger. And I just 2020 want to respond.

Once again, I agree with several of the things you said, but not everything. I don't think the Administration is against the industry, and I don't think that Democrats are

2024 against the industry. I think we have different policy views 2025 sometimes on how to get things done.

But I know for a fact that the members of the White House have met with people in my district who are in the industry, who are asking questions about how we can deal with refining issues, how we can deal with capacity issues, how we can try to work together.

Certainly, there have been a lot of things said that I 2031 2032 don't agree with, and I try to call those out every time. I represent a lot of people who work very hard in this 2033 industry. But I think we all want to see reliable energy, 2034 and we want to see an above -- all-of-the-above approach, and 2035 we want to invest in all kinds of technologies. 2036 That is what the Administration is doing. That is what we did in the 2037 legislation we passed in the last Congress. And I think it 2038 is really important for all of us to work together and not 2039 politicize this issue, but work to bring energy to the 2040 American people. 2041

And with that, I have exceeded my time, and I will yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2044 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. Any other 2045 members seeking recognition?

I will recognize myself. I move to strike the last word and speak in favor of the amendment.

I appreciate the gentlelady's comments. I look forward to working with you on permitting reform. I think there is a lot of opportunity for bipartisan work in this Congress. I want to see that happen in this subcommittee to move some bills like permitting reform.

Before I came to this committee, I chaired the Western 2053 2054 Hemisphere Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs. I have been working on energy for a long time. And under the Obama 2055 Administration, Secretary Clinton actually negotiated the 2056 Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement with Mexico to start 2057 developing the resources in the Gulf of Mexico under the 2058 2059 maritime boundary between the United States and Mexico, shared resources that were going to be developed for energy 2060 production, working with our neighbors to the south. 2061

As chair of Western Hemisphere, I talked a lot about these type of things, working with our neighbors to the north and to the south on energy issues. It is interesting that, when we talk about pipelines, we also need to talk about transmission lines that go across the northern border and provide electricity both north and south. North Dakota and

2068 Saskatchewan are working on a carbon sequestration and carbon 2069 pipeline to take carbon from North Dakota into Saskatchewan 2070 for carbon capture. Those are also cross-border 2071 infrastructure projects.

I think there is a lot of opportunity to work under this 2072 piece of legislation with our neighbors to the north and 2073 south, whether that is Mexican resources coming to Texas to 2074 be refined, or whether that is from the Eagle Ford going into 2075 2076 Mexico -- natural gas, primarily, from Texas going to Mexico, shared resources being developed, U.S. resources, Mexican 2077 resources, Canadian resources flowing north and south, 2078 helping North American energy independence be achieved, but 2079 also addressing climate with carbon projects -- as I 2080 mentioned earlier, North Dakota and Saskatchewan. 2081

I hope to lead a CODEL to Saskatchewan to meet with Premier Moe, talk about these projects that are going on, binational projects. So I support this amendment, and if no other members seek recognition I will yield back my time and call for the vote.

The underlying question is on the amendment offered by Mr. Walberg, and those in favor of the amendment, say aye. Those opposed, no.

2090 The ayes have it, in the opinion of the chair, and
2091 *Ms. DeGette. A recorded vote.
2092 *Mr. Duncan Ms. DeGette calls for a recorded vote.
2093 The clerk will call the roll.
2094 *The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
2095 *Mr. Burgess. Votes aye.
2096 *The Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes aye.
2097 Rep. Latta?
2098 *Mr. Latta. Aye.
2099 *The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
2100 Rep. Guthrie?
2101 [No response.]
2102 *The Clerk. Rep. Griffith?
2103 [No response.]
2104 *The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
2105 *Mr. Johnson. Aye.
2106 *Mr. Griffith. Aye.
2107 *The Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes aye.
2108 Rep. Johnson?
2109 *Mr. Johnson. [Inaudible.]
2110 *The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
2111 Rep. Bucshon?
100

2112	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
2113	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
2114	Rep. Walberg?
2115	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
2116	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.
2117	Rep. Palmer?
2118	*Mr. Palmer. [Inaudible.]
2119	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes aye.
2120	Rep. Curtis?
2121	[No response.]
2122	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko?
2123	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
2124	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
2125	Rep. Pence?
2126	[No response.]
2127	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong?
2128	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
2129	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.
2130	Rep. Armstrong?
2131	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
2132	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes aye.
2133	Rep. Weber?

2134	*Mr. Weber. Aye	e.
2135	*The Clerk. Rep	o. Weber votes aye.
2136	Rep. Balderson?	
2137	*Mr. Balderson.	[Inaudible.]
2138	*The Clerk. Rep	o. Balderson votes aye.
2139	Rep. Pfluger?	
2140	*Mr. Pfluger. A	Aye.
2141	*The Clerk. Rep	o. Pfluger votes aye.
2142	Rep. Rodgers?	
2143	*The Chair. [In	naudible.]
2144	*The Clerk. Rep	. Rodgers votes aye.
2145	Rep. Duncan?	
2146	*Mr. Duncan. []	Inaudible.]
2147	*The Clerk. Rep	o. Duncan votes aye.
2148	Rep. DeGette?	
2149	*Ms. DeGette. N	Jo.
2150	*The Clerk. Rep	. DeGette votes no.
2151	Rep. Peters?	
2152	[No response.]	
2153	*The Clerk. Rep	D. Fletcher?
2154	*Mrs. Fletcher.	Aye.
2155	*The Clerk. Rep	o. Fletcher votes aye.
		100

2156	Rep. Matsui?
2157	*Ms. Matsui. No.
2158	*The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes no.
2159	Rep. Tonko?
2160	*Mr. Tonko. No.
2161	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes no.
2162	Rep. Veasey?
2163	[No response.]
2164	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?
2165	*Ms. Kuster. No.
2166	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.
2167	Rep. Schrier?
2168	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
2169	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.
2170	Rep. Castor?
2171	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]
2172	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.
2173	Rep. Sarbanes?
2174	[No response.]
2175	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
2176	*Mr. Cardenas. No.
2177	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.
	103

2178	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
2179	[No response.]
2180	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone?
2181	*Mr. Pallone. No.
2182	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.
2183	*Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Chair?
2184	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members not recorded?
2185	*Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Chair, how am I
2186	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Guthrie reported?
2187	*The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie is not recorded.
2188	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
2189	*The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes aye.
2190	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Peters recorded?
2191	*The Clerk. Mr. Peters is not recorded.
2192	*Mr. Peters. No.
2193	*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
2194	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members not recorded?
2195	The clerk will report the totals.
2196	[Pause.]
2197	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 17 ayes
2198 a	and 9 noes.
2199	*Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the amendment is
	104

```
agreed to.
2200
2201
           For what purpose does Ms. DeGette seek recognition?
           *Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
2202
2203
      desk, No. SC02.
           *Mr. Duncan. The clerk will report the amendment.
2204
           *The Clerk. Amendment offered by Ms. DeGette. Page 2,
2205
      line 25, strike "unless,' ' and insert "if,' ' page 3, line 2 -
2206
2207
      _
2208
           *Ms. DeGette. I ask unanimous consent to consider the
2209
      amendment as read.
           *Mr. Duncan. The clerk will dispense with the reading.
2210
2211
2212
2213
           [The amendment of Ms. DeGette follows:]
2214
2215
      2216
2217
```

2218 *Mr. Duncan. And Ms. DeGette is recognized to explain 2219 the amendment.

*Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as written, H.R. 1058 creates a presumption that any crossborder pipeline or transmission line is in the national interest.

This bill requires that 120 days after the completion 2224 and publication of a project's environmental review, FERC or 2225 2226 the Department of Energy grant a certification of crossing to a project developer unless the facility is not in the public 2227 interest. So this effectively creates a presumption that 2228 FERC and DoE must grant certificates unless they find the 2229 facilities not in the public interest. And so what that 2230 does, it establishes a ticking clock for them to make that 2231 decision and provide the evidence supporting the decision. 2232 So what this amendment does is simply flips the 2233 presumption under the amendment. The 120-day clock would 2234 remain, but FERC or DoE would only grant a public 2235 2236 certification if they found the project was in the public interest. This seems to make a lot of sense to me. 2237 It is the same way that we treat LNG exports. The agency 2238 affirmatively finds that the export is within the public 2239

2240	interest, and I think that determination has served us well,
2241	and I so I oppose the efforts to remove it.
2242	The bill, I think, asks far too much of FERC and DoE,
2243	because it asks them to become arbiters of international
2244	affairs in an inappropriate way that is way outside of their
2245	purview. And so, as written, if the agencies are not sure if
2246	a pipeline or transmission line would be in the national
2247	interest, it wouldn't matter, it would be built anyway. So
2248	from an economic security perspective, that is not tenable.
2249	And from a national security perspective, I think it is
2250	downright irresponsible.
2251	And so I would urge support of this amendment. I think
2252	it is common sense, and I would yield back.
2253	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members who seek recognition?
2254	Mr. Armstrong is recognized.
2255	*Mr. Armstrong. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to
2256	speak in opposition to the amendment.
2257	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.
2258	*Mr. Armstrong. I will start with a question, and that
2259	is, is there some really secret underlying Cold War with
2260	Canada that I am unaware of?
2261	Our North American allies are significant energy trading

partners. We share roughly 40 transmission interconnections 2262 2263 with Canada, as well as a few interconnections with Mexico. We also share significant amounts of oil and gas pipeline on 2264 2265 our northern and southern borders. This amendment would change the criteria on which a border-crossing facility 2266 certificate can be issued, requiring a positive public 2267 interest determination to be found before issuing the 2268 certificate. 2269 2270 The current text requires a negative finding to be made in order for a certificate not to be issued. 2271 Under current law, LNG exports are automatically deemed in the public 2272 interest if the export is to a country with which we have a 2273 free trade agreement. Any export of oil, gas, or electricity 2274 to our northern American allies should have the same 2275 criteria, and be deemed in the public interest. 2276 I urge a no vote on this amendment, and I yield back. 2277 The gentleman yields back. Does anyone *Mr. Duncan. 2278 else seek recognition to speak on the amendment? 2279 2280 Seeing none, a recorded vote has been requested, so we will just go straight to that. The clerk will call the roll. 2281 *The Clerk. Rep. Burgess? 2282 *Mr. Burgess. [Inaudible.] 2283
2284	*The	Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes no.
2285	Rep.	Latta?
2286	*Mr.	Latta. [Inaudible.]
2287	*The	Clerk. Rep. Latta votes no.
2288	Rep.	Guthrie?
2289	*Mr.	Guthrie. No.
2290	*The	Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes no.
2291	Rep.	Griffith?
2292	*Mr.	Griffith. No.
2293	*The	Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes no.
2294	Rep.	Johnson?
2295	*Mr.	Johnson. No.
2296	*The	Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes no.
2297	Rep.	Bucshon?
2298	*Mr.	Bucshon. No.
2299	*The	Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes no.
2300	Rep.	Walberg?
2301	*Mr.	Walberg. No.
2302	*The	Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes no.
2303	Rep.	Palmer?
2304	*Mr.	Palmer. No.
2305	*The	Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes no.

2306 R	ep. Curtis?	
2307 []	No response	e.]
2308 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Lesko?
2309 *]	Mrs. Lesko.	[Inaudible.]
2310 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Lesko votes no.
2311 R	ep. Pence?	
2312 *]	Mr. Pence.	No.
2313 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Pence votes no.
2314 R	ep. Armstro	ong?
2315 *1	Mr. Armstro	ong. No.
2316 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Armstrong votes no.
2317 R	ep. Weber?	
2318 *]	Mr. Weber.	No.
2319 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Weber votes no.
2320 R	ep. Balders	son?
2321 *1	Mr. Balders	on. [Inaudible.]
2322 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Balderson votes no.
2323 R	ep. Pfluger	?
2324 *]	Mr. Pfluger	No.
2325 *	The Clerk.	Rep. Pfluger votes no.
2326 R	ep. Rodgers	?
2327 *	The Chair.	[Inaudible.]

2328	*The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes no.
2329	Rep. Duncan?
2330	*Mr. Duncan. No.
2331	*The Clerk. Rep. Duncan votes no.
2332	Rep. DeGette?
2333	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
2334	*The Clerk. Rep. DeGette votes aye/
2335	Rep. Peters?
2336	*Mr. Peters. [Inaudible.]
2337	*The Clerk. Rep. Peters votes aye.
2338	Rep. Fletcher?
2339	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
2340	*The Clerk. Rep. Fletcher votes aye.
2340	
2341	Rep. Matsui?
	Rep. Matsui? *Ms. Matsui. Aye.
2341	
2341 2342	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
2341 2342 2343	*Ms. Matsui. Aye. *The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes aye.
2341 2342 2343 2344	*Ms. Matsui. Aye. *The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes aye. Rep. Tonko?
2341 2342 2343 2344 2345	*Ms. Matsui. Aye. *The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes aye. Rep. Tonko? *Mr. Tonko. Aye.
2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346	<pre>*Ms. Matsui. Aye. *The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes aye. Rep. Tonko? *Mr. Tonko. Aye. *The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes aye?</pre>

2350	*Ms. Kuster. Aye.
2351	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes aye.
2352	Rep. Schrier?
2353	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
2354	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes aye.
2355	Rep. Castor?
2356	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]
2357	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes aye.
2358	Rep. Sarbanes?
2359	[No response.]
2360	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
2361	*Mr. Cardenas. [Inaudible.]
2362	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes aye.
2363	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
2364	[No response.]
2365	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone?
2366	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
2367	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes aye.
2368	*Mr. Duncan. Any member not recorded?
2369	The clerk will report the total.
2370	[Pause.]
2371	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 10 ayes
	110

```
and 16 noes.
2372
2373
           *Mr. Duncan. The noes have it, and the amendment is not
      agreed to.
2374
2375
           Any further discussion on the bill, as amendment --
      amended?
2376
           Hearing none, the underlying question is passage of the
2377
      bill, as amendment -- amended, and that is H.R. 1058.
2378
           A recorded vote has been requested. The clerk will
2379
2380
      report the -- will record the -- call the roll.
2381
           *The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
           *Mr. Burgess. [Inaudible.]
2382
           *The Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes aye.
2383
2384
           Rep. Latta?
2385
           *Mr. Latta. Aye.
2386
           *The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
           Rep. Guthrie?
2387
           *Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
2388
           *The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes aye.
2389
2390
           Rep. Griffith?
           *Mr. Griffith. Aye.
2391
           *The Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes aye.
2392
           Rep. Johnson?
2393
```

2394	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
2395	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
2396	Rep. Bucshon?
2397	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
2398	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
2399	Rep. Walberg?
2400	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
2401	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.
2402	Rep. Palmer?
2403	*Mr. Palmer. [Inaudible.]
2404	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes aye.
2405	Rep. Curtis?
2406	*Mr. Curtis. [Inaudible.]
2407	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.
2408	Rep. Lesko?
2409	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
2410	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
2411	Rep. Pence?
2412	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
2413	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.
2414	Rep. Armstrong?
2415	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.

2416	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Armstrong votes aye.
2417	Rep.	Weber?		
2418	*Mr.	Weber.	Aye.	
2419	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Weber votes aye.
2420	Rep.	Balderso	n?	
2421	*Mr.	Balderso	n. A	Aye.
2422	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Balderson votes aye.
2423	Rep.	Pfluger?		
2424	*Mr.	Pfluger.	Aye	2.
2425	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Pfluger votes aye.
2426	Rep.	Rodgers?		
2427	*The	Chair.	[Inaı	udible.]
2428	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Rodgers votes aye.
2429	Rep.	Duncan?		
2430	*Mr.	Duncan.	Aye.	
2431	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Duncan votes aye.
2432	Rep.	DeGette?		
2433	*Ms.	DeGette.	[Ir	naudible.]
2434	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	DeGette votes no.
2435	Rep.	Peters?		
2436	*Mr.	Peters.	No.	
2437	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Peters votes no.
				115

2438	Rep. Fletcher?
2439	*Mrs. Fletcher. No.
2440	*The Clerk. Rep. Fletcher votes no.
2441	Rep. Matsui?
2442	*Ms. Matsui. No.
2443	*The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes no.
2444	Rep. Tonko?
2445	*Mr. Tonko. No.
2446	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes no.
2447	Rep. Veasey?
2448	[No response.]
2449	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?
2450	*Ms. Kuster. [Inaudible.]
2451	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.
2452	Rep. Schrier?
2453	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
2454	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.
2455	Rep. Castor?
2456	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]
2457	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.
2458	Rep. Sarbanes?
2459	[No response.]

2460	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
	*Mr. Cardenas. No.
2461	
2462	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.
2463	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
2464	[No response.]
2465	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone?
2466	*Mr. Pallone. [Inaudible.]
2467	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.
2468	*Mr. Duncan. Is any member not recorded?
2469	Seeing none, the clerk will report the total.
2470	[Pause.]
2471	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 17 ayes
2472	and 10 noes.
2473	*Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill is
2474	amendment amended, and will be reported to the full
2475	committee.
2476	The clerk will now the chair will call up H. Con.
2477	Resolution 14, and ask the clerk to report.
2478	*The Clerk. H. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution
2479	expressing disapproval of the revocation by President Biden
2480	of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline.
2481	Whereas

2482	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
2483	the resolution is dispensed with. The resolution will be
2484	open for amendment at any point.
2485	[The resolution follows:]
2486	
2487	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
2488	

*Mr. Duncan. Any bipartisan amendments to be offered? 2489 2490 Any further discussion on the bill? The chair will recognize Mrs. Lesko for -- to describe 2491 2492 the amendment. The bill, rather. *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am proud to 2493 cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 14, expressing 2494 disapproval of the revocation by President Biden of the 2495 presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. 2496 2497 On September 16th, 2019, President Biden said -- and I quote -- "I want you to look at my eyes. I guarantee you, I 2498 quarantee you we are going to end fossil fuels.' And 2499 canceling the Keystone XL pipeline was just Biden's first 2500 2501 step. 2502 This is a simple resolution, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it. The Keystone XL 2503 pipeline was once a bipartisan issue that at least one of our 2504 Democratic colleagues on this committee supported. 2505 It is important, as members of this committee, to periodically 2506

express our disapproval when the President makes unwise, unilateral decisions that affect millions of Americans and costs the U.S. Treasury billions of dollars. This is such a time to do so.

On Biden's first day in office he canceled the Keystone 2511 2512 XL pipeline permit, and with it the 830,000 barrels per day of oil that would have flowed through it from Canada to U.S. 2513 2514 refineries. President Biden's actions were wrong in five 2515 ways.

Canceling the Keystone pipeline did not actually stop 2516 the drilling or exporting of the Canadian oil sands, as the 2517 extreme environmentalists thought. The 830,000 barrels per 2518 2519 day of crude oil from Alberta, Canada set a record for exports in 2022. The cancellation of the pipeline also did 2520 little to stop emissions. Oil is now transported by rails 2521 and trucks, which have higher emissions than a pipeline. 2522 Number two, President Biden insulted our best ally, 2523 2524 Canada. Alberta Premier Jason Kenney said, "Sadly, it is an

insult directed at the United States' most important ally.' ` 2525 Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau echoed this same 2526 disappointment. 2527

Number three, the developer, TC Energy, a Canadian 2528 2529 company, is now suing the U.S. under provisions of the Free Trade Agreement, and they will likely recover over \$8 billion 2530 in damages. 2531

2532

Number four, the local communities where the pipeline

was to be located will continue to lose millions in lost tax revenues.

2535 Number five, finally, the ultimate cost of this reckless 2536 executive order is now reported to be as much as 59,000 jobs 2537 and up to \$9.6 billion that would have helped our economy 2538 thrive.

It is asked in previous comments by my Democratic 2539 colleagues, why are we bringing this up? This is the first 2540 2541 time that this committee has had the opportunity to voice our opinion on this disastrous decision. The previous Congress 2542 largely ignored this issue. The previous Congress largely 2543 ignored this whole decision. As a matter of fact, by this 2544 committee's silence on the issue, it has endorsed President 2545 2546 Biden's all-of-the-government approach to eliminate fossil This energy policy has been a big cause of our 2547 fuels. record-high inflation, which has harmed all Americans. 2548

It is about time our constituents know how we feel. Canceling the pipeline was a reckless, out-of-touch decision, and it must be addressed. I hope all of you will vote in favor of this resolution, and I yield back.

2553 *Mr. Duncan. Any other members seeking recognition?2554 For what purpose does the Ranking Member DeGette seek

2555 recognition?

2556 *Ms. DeGette. I seek recognition to oppose the 2557 concurrent resolution.

2558 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognized for five 2559 minutes.

Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr.
Chairman, we already had Groundhog Day. It was last month,
but I feel like we are having it again, because here we are
talking about the Keystone XL pipeline, which we talked about
a lot in this committee over the years.

Irrespective of what your position on the Keystone XL 2565 pipeline was, irrespective of what your views on what 2566 President Biden said were, the fact is TransCanada has now 2567 2568 declared it would stop pursuing the project, and the pipeline is effectively dead. But this is what I have been saying 2569 since my opening statement about these resolutions and bills 2570 They are not actually trying to solve the energy 2571 todav. issue in this country. They are just about people emoting 2572 2573 about how they feel about the past.

I heard my colleagues talking about things that John Kerry said eight years ago. Now we are hearing about the Keystone XL pipeline. And in fact, this isn't even a bill

2577 that would do something. It is a resolution condemning 2578 something that happened two years ago.

So Keystone XL would not have done anything to alleviate 2579 2580 the cost and impacts of climate change, wouldn't have done anything to alleviate the high prices at the pump that 2581 American consumers faced the last year. It wouldn't have 2582 done anything to address the fact that oil companies are 2583 embarking on massive dividends and stock buybacks. It was it 2584 2585 was really an idea -- I know we debated it a long time, but wouldn't have solved any of these problems. 2586

And so what I think we should do is stop rehashing all of the things we debated for many, many years, and doing, frankly, resolutions that aren't going to lead to anything, and we should sit down together and try to figure out how we are going to solve these problems. I believe that we can, and I look forward to doing that as we move forward after today.

And so I urge all members who actually care about making substantive legislation on energy issues to oppose resolutions that don't do anything except for give people's opinions.

2598 And I yield back.

*Mr. Duncan. Any other member seeking recognition? 2599 The gentleman from Alabama, for what purpose do you seek 2600 recognition? 2601 2602 *Mr. Palmer. I want to speak in favor, and --*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized. 2603 *Mr. Palmer. -- would move to strike the last word. 2604 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2605 Again, I sit here and I am just amazed at what I hear. 2606 2607 Obviously, there are some folks that don't understand supply and demand, but 835,000 barrels of Canadian oil coming into 2608 the marketplace in the United States would have lowered 2609 energy cost. 2610 There is 20 -- Mr. Chairman, there is 20 million 2611 2612 households that are behind on their household utility bills because of the policies of this Administration, particularly 2613 in respect to natural gas. And while we are doing things 2614 like this, Russia and China collaborated to build a pipeline 2615 that is supplying 1.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per 2616 2617 year to China. That pipeline is 1,875 miles long, okay? So we are letting our hydrocarbon infrastructure go into 2618 decline. We are increasing prices for people at the pump, 2619 but particularly in terms of household utilities. And a 2620

2621 nation whose energy production is in decline is not a nation 2622 that can have a very bright economic future.

So I support this bill, these -- and these other bills that we are bringing up, because it is in the essential best interest of every American and the essential, best interest of our economic security, and the essential, best interest of our national security.

2628 I yield back.

2629 *Mr. Pfluger. Will the gentleman yield to Mr. Pfluger?
2630 *Mr. Palmer. I would be happy to yield.

2631 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you.

2632 Why is it important to rehash this? Because our

2633 constituents are asking for it, because the American people 2634 are asking for it. At a very micro level, we are rehashing 2635 this because prices on everything have gone up, because 2636 thousands of families are no longer employed in a project 2637 that they were promised employment on. This is very similar 2638 to 1058, the cross-border energy infrastructure bill that we 2639 just discussed.

And the reason that TransCanada is stopping construction, or saying they are not going to pursue it, is because it was expropriated. This was expropriated from

them. It is basically the exact same thing as a third-world country policy where you don't have the environment, the investment certainty.

2646 In effect, President Biden has said no to North American dominance. He has said no to thousands of workers in the 2647 United States, to our ability to counter OPEC from Canada 2648 through the United States and into Mexico, for a North 2649 American organization, if you want to call it that, to 2650 counter China. 2651 The President has literally thrown away the resources that we have right here in favor of outsourcing our 2652 jobs, in favor of dirtier sources of energy, in favor of 2653 slave labor and human rights violations in places like China. 2654 2655 That is why we are rehashing this.

That is why this is important to have this discussion right here, because if we don't do it, not only do we lose jobs and have higher costs for energy, but we also give that source of geopolitical power to our adversaries.

I couldn't agree more with what Mrs. Lesko is doing here, in addition to the efforts of all the bills here that are important to rehash because our policy has gone so wrong for the last two years.

And with that, I yield back.

*Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, you know, I have learned 2665 2666 through my own life experiences and observing things in history that smart people learn from their mistakes. 2667 Thev 2668 don't double down on them. And that is what it appears that some people want to do, is double down on the mistakes that 2669 we are making. And I really do believe that it has become an 2670 existential threat to our national security to continue this. 2671 I mean, particularly to -- this false argument that we 2672 2673 are dependent on any other country, much less the Middle East, for our energy supplies, it is a complete false 2674 narrative. What we would do, though, is become completely 2675 dependent on China for a renewable power grid. That would be 2676 2677 an enormous mistake. And I yield back. 2678 2679 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any further discussion on the resolution? 2680 Seeing none, a roll call vote has been recorded --2681 requested, so the clerk will call the roll. 2682 2683 *The Clerk. Rep. Burgess? 2684 [No response.] *The Clerk. Rep. Latta? 2685 *Mr. Latta. Aye. 2686

2687	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
2688	Rep. Guthrie?
2689	[No response.]
2690	*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith?
2691	[No response.]
2692	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
2693	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
2694	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
2695	Rep. Bucshon?
2696	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
2697	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
2698	Rep. Walberg?
2699	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
2700	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.
2701	Rep. Palmer?
2702	*Mr. Palmer. Aye.
2703	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes aye.
2704	Rep. Curtis?
2705	*Mr. Curtis. [Inaudible.]
2706	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.
2707	Rep. Lesko?
2708	*Mrs. Lesko. [Inaudible.]

2709	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
2710	Rep. Pence?
2711	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
2712	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.
2713	Rep. Armstrong?
2714	[No response.]
2715	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber?
2716	*Mr. Weber. Aye.
2717	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes aye.
2718	Rep. Balderson?
2719	*Mr. Balderson. Aye.
2720	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.
2721	Rep. Pfluger?
2722	*Mr. Pfluger. [Inaudible.]
2723	*The Clerk. Rep. Pfluger votes aye.
2724	Rep. Rodgers?
2725	*The Chair. [Inaudible.]
2726	*The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes aye.
2727	Rep. Duncan?
2728	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
2729	*The Clerk. Rep. Duncan votes aye.
2730	Rep. DeGette?

2731	*Ms. DeGette. No.
2732	*The Clerk. Rep. DeGette votes no.
2733	Rep. Peters?
2734	*Mr. Peters. [Inaudible.]
2735	*The Clerk. Rep. Peters votes no.
2736	Rep. Fletcher?
2737	*Mrs. Fletcher. No.
2738	*The Clerk. Rep. Fletcher votes no.
2739	Rep. Matsui?
2740	*Ms. Matsui. No.
2741	*The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes no.
2742	Rep. Tonko?
2743	*Mr. Tonko. No.
2744	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes no.
2745	Rep. Veasey?
2746	[No response.]
2747	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?
2748	*Ms. Kuster. [Inaudible.]
2749	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.
2750	Rep. Schrier?
2751	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
2752	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.

2753	Rep. Castor?					
2754	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]					
2755	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.					
2756	Rep. Sarbanes?					
2757	[No response.]					
2758	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?					
2759	*Mr. Cardenas. [Inaudible.]					
2760	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.					
2761	Rep. Blunt Rochester?					
2762	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. [Inaudible.]					
2763	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes no.					
2764	Rep. Pallone?					
2765	*Mr. Pallone. Nay.					
2766	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.					
2767	*Mr. Duncan. Any member unrecorded?					
2768	Mr. Guthrie.					
2769	*Mr. Guthrie. I vote aye.					
2770	*The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes aye.					
2771	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Armstrong recorded?					
2772	*The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong is not recorded.					
2773	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.					
2774	*The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong votes aye.					

*Mr. Duncan. Any other member unrecorded? 2775 2776 The clerk will report the total. [Pause.] 2777 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 15 ayes 2778 and 11 noes. 2779 *Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the resolution is 2780 agreed to. 2781 The chair will now call up H. Con. Resolution 17, and 2782 2783 ask the clerk to report. *The Clerk. H. Con. Res 17, a concurrent resolution 2784 expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Government 2785 should not impose any restrictions on the export of crude oil 2786 or other petroleum products. 2787 Without objection, the first reading of 2788 *Mr. Duncan. the resolution is dispensed with, and the resolution will be 2789 open for amendment at any point. 2790 [The resolution follows:] 2791 2792 2793 2794

*Mr. Duncan. The chair will now recognize Mr. Guthrie,
the author of the resolution, to explain what it does.
*Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to thank
the committee for including my bill in this markup today.
This resolution affirms Congress's bipartisan vote in
2015 to repeal the decades-long export ban on crude oil and
petroleum products.

Additionally, it says that the Federal Government should not impose overly restrictive regulations on the exploration, production, or marketing of energy resources, or restrictions on the export of crude oil and petroleum products.

2806 When Congress lifted the export ban, the American oil 2807 and gas industry was reinvigorated. Investments in domestic 2808 energy production increased, creating new American jobs and 2809 unleashing economic development. As a result of this 2810 investment, the United States emerged as the leading producer 2811 in the world and, in 2019, became a net exporter of petroleum 2812 products for the first time since 1952.

2813 President Biden and some of our colleagues on the other 2814 side of the aisle have floated reinstating the export ban as 2815 a way to increase domestic supply and decrease prices at the 2816 pump. Reinstating the export ban will likely have the

2817 opposite effect. By shrinking the market available to 2818 American crude oil and other petroleum products, American oil 2819 and gas companies will likely reduce domestic investments. 2820 This ultimately risks higher prices at the pump and higher 2821 home heating bills.

It also jeopardizes our national security. American oil 2822 and gas exports make us and our allies less dependent on 2823 energy from dictators. We are seeing this play out now in 2824 2825 Europe. For years, Russia has been able to leverage its energy sector over other countries, including our NATO allies 2826 and other European partners. The Russian oil and gas sector 2827 has, in large part, funded Russia's illegal and unprovoked 2828 invasion of Ukraine. 2829

However, since the invasion, U.S. LNG exports have helped our European allies replace Russian energy imports, helping keep the lights on homes and -- lights on and homes heated across Europe, while also cutting off resources for Putin's war machine in Ukraine.

If we reverse course and reinstate the export ban without their own domestic alternatives, our European partners will once again be at the mercy of foreign dictators like Putin, undermining their national security and ours.

Putin would be only -- would only benefit of a ban on American exports, while American consumers would suffer. The Biden Administration's anti-fossil fuel agenda is to blame for high energy prices. In order to increase supply and alleviate high prices of -- for Americans, we should be supporting policies that unleash American energy.

I had a chance just recently to meet with some high-2845 ranking European colleagues -- and these aren't from the 2846 2847 right-of-center parties, these are from most of the governing parties in part of Europe, and their mission to us as we left 2848 was, "produce more gas, produce more gas.' ' That is what 2849 they need to survive, and -- or in order to -- you know, 2850 Germany right now, I think, is three times the price of 2851 energy that it is -- three or four times as it is here. And 2852 they say they need that to move forward. I said survive. 2853 That is not correct. They need it in order to continually 2854 offset what they are doing in funding Putin's war on Ukraine. 2855 So I urge my colleagues to support my resolution, and I 2856

2857 yield back.

2858 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any other 2859 members seeking recognition on the resolution?

2860 Seeing none, I will recognize myself. I move to strike

the last word and speak in support of the resolution.

In 2015 Congress passed a bipartisan bill to repeal the 1970s-era restrictions on the export of crude oil. The bill was signed into law by President Obama. Since then, we have seen the benefits of free trade and open markets in the energy sector, economic benefits, energy security benefits, flexibility on the global stage, America actually competing with some of our adversaries.

Before the Biden Administration took office, the United States was the world's leading energy producer, and a net exporter of energy. As a direct result of Congress and President Obama lifting the crude oil export ban, OPEC, China, and Russia's power over the world oil markets had been diminished.

2875 We should not be in the business of putting restrictions 2876 on certain commodities. We should continue to uphold the 2877 commitment to free trade and open markets in order to provide 2878 domestic economic benefits, enhanced energy security, 2879 flexibility in the foreign diplomacy, as was intended by the 2880 bipartisan bill in 2015.

2881 So I support Mr. Guthrie's resolution, urge my 2882 colleagues to do so. And with that I yield back.

2883 Any further discussion on the resolution?

2884 Ms. Castor of Florida is recognized for five minutes.

2885 *Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2886 Well, members, I think this goes way too far, and we are 2887 -- we need to rethink this.

I hope that we are all concerned with China's growing 2888 ties with the Kremlin. Right now, the leader of Belarus, who 2889 is a proxy for Vladimir Putin, is meeting with the dictator 2890 2891 from China. They are considering restocking Russia as the ammunition dwindles and their stocks of weapons dwindle. 2892 Think about the broader context here on what is being 2893 supplied to the authoritarian CCP. This would allow 2894 additional carte blanche exports to China and our 2895 2896 adversaries. That is the wrong way to go at this point in 2897 time.

Right now, there are U.S. companies, oil and gas companies, that have enriched themselves while also enriching the CCP strategic intentions. They are inking deals right now of American-produced oil and gas. And I think it is wrong for us to go on record and say, yes, let's make it easier for dictators and adversaries to make deals with American big oil and gas companies.

So I would just caution you to go back to the drawing 2905 2906 board on this. I can't support it, and I hope you all will vote no, as well. 2907 2908 And at this point I will yield back my time. *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. Any further 2909 discussion? 2910 Mrs. Fletcher is recognized. 2911 *Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to 2912 2913 be very clear that I support energy exports. That is something we do out of my district and our region, in the 2914 Houston region. Not only do we refine a lot of the products 2915 we are talking about today, but we export them to the world. 2916 And I think it is critically important that we continue to do 2917 that. And I think that the 2015 legislation to remove the 2918 export ban was the right legislation, as you all have pointed 2919 out, signed into law by President Obama. I think there is 2920

2921 bipartisan support for these exports.

I certainly have heard the concerns and discussion over the last year or so that some people have suggested reinstituting an export ban, and I do not support that. I do not think that that is the right thing.

I am having a little trouble, though, kind of

reconciling this bill with the bill that was on the floor of the House just a couple of weeks ago prohibiting exports from the SPR to China, and the sale of those to China. I think that what I see here is that this isn't really necessary, this resolution, and it is too broad. It is -- you know, it is sort of big.

It says we can't have any regulations on this at all. And I think that that undermines what we have been talking about, which is energy security and our energy policy is a really important foreign policy issue and tool, and this is our national security. And so I think that the breadth of this resolution unnecessarily ties our hands in a way that we don't need to, and that we shouldn't.

But I absolutely don't think that we should be banning exports right now, and I don't think that there is a serious conversation about doing that. I would not support that.

But like I said, I think that we just don't need to do this resolution at this time. I think it is overly broad, and I think, rather than speaking on the next bill, I will say I think it -- you know, there are similar concerns about removing DoE approvals. We have a system in place to take into account. The national security issues and the moment

2949 that we are living in -- and actually, I think, when we look 2950 ahead at kind of the process we have on LNG, I think that is 2951 what we should be doing more broadly, rather than repealing 2952 that, as well.

2953 So I can talk on that when that comes up, but ultimately 2954 I am going to vote no on this bill, and I -- on this 2955 resolution, and I just -- I urge my colleagues to do the 2956 same. I think it is overly broad and unnecessary.

2957 *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentlelady yield?

2958 *Mrs. Fletcher. Yes.

Mr. Duncan. Thank you. I think the difference in this resolution and the bill you mentioned that was on the floor dealing with the SPR is we are talking about open and free markets, and the sale of a commodity versus a strategic asset that the United States stores to be used when we have a time of emergency.

And with the Biden Administration releasing oil from the SPR and allowing adversaries to buy it to replenish their Strategic Petroleum Reserves, that is where the difference is: free market commodity produced in America sold versus a strategic asset. I think that is the biggest difference, and I just wanted to point that out, and I appreciate the lady

2971 yielding.

2972 *Mrs. Fletcher. Well, thank you. And I just want to note I certainly understand that difference. But once we 2973 2974 sell oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which we have done many times, including as authorized by this committee 2975 for things unrelated to lowering the price of gas -- like 2976 when we used it to fund the 20th Century Cures Act, the 21st 2977 Century Cures Act -- I think it is important to recognize 2978 2979 that that oil is just sold onto the open market, and it can then be sold beyond that. And so really, sort of a 2980 distinction in this moment without a difference. 2981

If we are talking about free markets, then we are talking about putting things into this market. If what we are talking about is understanding the national security implications of our partners, then it makes sense to allow for consideration of that in terms of our policy, and not limit our ability to execute our foreign policy and other policy objectives in this way.

2989 So I just -- like I said, I think it is overly broad. I 2990 appreciate your distinction, but I still don't think that I 2991 can support this resolution, and I yield back.

2992 *Mr. Duncan. Yes, the gentlelady yields back. Any

2993	further discussion on the resolution?
2994	Seeing none, the clerk will report the total a roll
2995	call vote has been requested, and the clerk will call the
2996	roll.
2997	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
2998	[No response.]
2999	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta?
3000	*Mr. Latta. [Inaudible.]
3001	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
3002	Rep. Guthrie?
3003	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
3004	*The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes aye.
3005	Rep. Griffith?
3006	[No response.]
3007	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
3008	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
3009	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
3010	Rep. Bucshon?
3011	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
3012	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
3013	Rep. Walberg?
3014	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.

3015	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.					
3016	Rep. Palmer?					
3017	[No response.]					
3018	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis?					
3019	*Mr. Curtis. [Inaudible.]					
3020	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.					
3021	Rep. Lesko?					
3022	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.					
3023	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.					
3024	Rep. Pence?					
3025	*Mr. Pence. [Inaudible.]					
3026	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.					
3027	Rep. Armstrong?					
3028	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.					
3029	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes aye.					
3030	Rep. Weber?					
3031	*Mr. Weber. Aye.					
3032	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes aye.					
3033	Rep. Balderson?					
3034	*Mr. Balderson. [Inaudible.]					
3035	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.					
3036	Rep. Pfluger?					

3037	*Mr.	Pfluger.	Aye	2.	
3038	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	Pfluger votes aye.	
3039	Rep.	Rodgers?			
3040	*The	Chair.	[Inaı	udible.]	
3041	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	Rodgers votes aye.	
3042	Rep.	Duncan?			
3043	*Mr.	Duncan.	Aye.		
3044	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	Duncan votes aye.	
3045	Rep.	DeGette?			
3046	*Ms.	DeGette.	No.		
3047	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	DeGette votes no.	
3048	Rep.	Peters?			
3049	*Mr.	Peters.	[Ina	audible.]	
3050	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	Peters votes no.	
3051	Rep.	Fletcher?			
3052	*Mrs	. Fletcher	r. 1	10.	
3053	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	Fletcher votes no.	
3054	Rep.	Matsui?			
3055	*Ms.	Matsui.	No.		
3056	*The	Clerk. H	Rep.	Matsui votes no.	
3057	Rep.	Tonko?			
3058	*Mr.	Tonko. 1	No.		
3059	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes no.				
------	-------------------------------------				
3060	Rep. Veasey?				
3061	[No response.]				
3062	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?				
3063	*Ms. Kuster. No.				
3064	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster votes no.				
3065	Rep. Schrier?				
3066	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]				
3067	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.				
3068	Rep. Castor?				
3069	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]				
3070	*The Clerk. Rep. Castor votes no.				
3071	Rep. Sarbanes?				
3072	[No response.]				
3073	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?				
3074	*Mr. Cardenas. No.				
3075	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.				
3076	Rep. Blunt Rochester?				
3077	[No response.]				
3078	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone?				
3079	*Mr. Pallone. [Inaudible.]				
3080	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.				

3081	*Mr. Duncan. Any members not recorded?
3082	The clerk will report the total.
3083	[Pause.]
3084	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 14 ayes
3085	and 10 noes.
3086	*Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the resolution is
3087	agreed to.
3088	The chair will now call up H.R. 1130, and ask the clerk
3089	to report.
3090	*The Clerk. H.R. 1130, to repeal restrictions on the
3091	export and import of natural gas.
3092	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading
3093	of the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for
3094	amendment at any point.
3095	[The bill follows:]
3096	
3097	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
3098	

*Mr. Duncan. And the chair will now recognize Mr. 3099 3100 Johnson to explain the bill. *Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to 3101 3102 strike the last word. You know, last month I was encouraged when I saw our 3103 energy secretariat, the White House podium, being asked about 3104 LNG exports. She said, and I quote, "We know that our 3105 liquefied natural gas exports have been a significant help to 3106 3107 our allies.' ` And then she said, and I quote, "We are fortunate that we have an abundance, obviously, of natural 3108 gas in this country. Our prices are low.' ' 3109 She is right. And this isn't even the first time that I 3110 have commended her on her support for LNG exports either, 3111 especially in regards to how we can use this strategic 3112 resource to help Europe get out from under the boot of 3113 Vladimir Putin. I am certainly willing to give credit where 3114 credit is due. 3115 However, there is one problem. Just last April -- and 3116 3117 some of you remember this -- our Energy Secretary Granholm

3118 was slated to appear and face questions before this 3119 subcommittee. And I kid you not, the night before that 3120 hearing at quite literally the 11th hour, a press release

went out from DoE. It was the approval of an LNG export authorization that had been sitting at the Department of Energy for 463 days. What a convenient thing. What convenient timing.

Friends, colleagues, actions speak louder than words. 3125 And that is not the only one. In the last year we have seen 3126 these permits languish at DoE for 146 days, 678 days, 762 3127 I know everyone wants to talk permitting. 3128 davs. To my 3129 colleagues, wouldn't this issue of the hold-up at DoE be lowhanging fruit? The fact that major multi-billion-dollar 3130 FERC-approved globally strategic American energy investments 3131 can be held up at the whim of political appointees, that is 3132 3133 beyond unacceptable to me.

My bill would fix this. And also, I do have an amendment that we will discuss later to actually improve the legislation and prevent political interference from other agencies, as well.

With that, Mr. Chairman, allow me to take a minute to quickly respond to some of the critics of my legislation. America is the number-one global liquefied natural gas exporter right now, and our citizens will pay some of the lowest natural gas prices in the world. That is what is

happening right now, and that is not changing. 3143 The 3144 fearmongering about this legislation causing prices to skyrocket is unfounded, and it is not based in reality. 3145 3146 Some opponents have even went so far as to falsely say that expanding LNG exports would cause shortages of natural 3147 gas in the United States. Friends, as a member with a 3148 district directly atop the Marcellus and Utica Shale, trust 3149 me, we have plenty, actually way more than enough. In fact, 3150 3151 according to the latest estimates, the United States has well over a century's worth of natural gas supply. And according 3152 to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, in the next 3153 few decades domestic natural gas production is projected to 3154 increase twice as fast as domestic consumption, even 3155 3156 factoring in increased LNG exports.

If opponents of this legislation truly care about lowering natural gas prices or bills -- and natural gas-fired electricity bills for their constituents, they would stop blaming LNG exports and look in the mirror. It is true that some Americans could use some relief on their energy bills, but this is mainly due to radical environmentalist policies at the national, state, and local levels that

3164 disproportionately hit citizens in certain geographic areas

3165 like New England and the East Coast, for example. Folks, 3166 they are frequent -- folks, there frequently pay double or 3167 even triple the prices for natural gas than my constituents 3168 do in Ohio. Why? Because their left-wing leaders keep 3169 blocking new pipelines, and then enacting other wrongheaded 3170 energy policy decisions.

So my message is simple: America has plenty of natural 3171 gas to go around. If you are worried about natural gas 3172 3173 prices, build a pipeline to Ohio. We are happy to send you 3174 some. In the meantime, we will keep doing what we are doing. From Texas to Pennsylvania to Ohio, America's resource-3175 rich regions will keep producing abundant, affordable natural 3176 gas for our citizens and exporting clean American natural gas 3177 3178 around the world. Let's build on this, and make America the energy superpower of the 21st century. 3179

3180 With that, I urge my colleagues to support my 3181 legislation.

3182 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

3183 *Mr. Curtis. [Presiding] The gentleman yields. The 3184 chair recognizes the Ranking Member DeGette.

3185 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to 3186 strike the last word.

3187 *Mr. Curtis. You are recognized.

Ms. DeGette. Thanks. The first thing I want to do is I want to let my colleague from Ohio know -- and I told him this on the floor last night -- we were all so, so sorry about what has happened in his district, and very supportive of you with all of that.

3193 *Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentlelady for those 3194 comments.

Ms. DeGette. Now, talking about the bill, what it does is it really takes out the common-sense policies that were established under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act by removing the requirement that exporters seek approval from the Department of Energy that the exports are in the public interest.

3201 So what that would do is it would transform the natural 3202 gas market into a volatile global market that mimics the oil 3203 market, which is something that does not ensure affordable 3204 energy here at home. It is kind of ironic that that would be 3205 the result of this bill.

And frankly, any American who is getting tired of being gouged by the international oil market should be really concerned about this, because that is exactly what this bill

3209 would do. What it would do is it would remove the safeguards 3210 that prevent U.S. natural gas markets from being fully tied 3211 to international natural gas markets that are subject to the 3212 whims of the world's largest producers like Russia, Iran, and 3213 China.

The requirement that exports be in the public interest serves the public. It serves all of us here today, and it serves our constituents back home. But it doesn't serve the interests of the big oil and gas companies, and that is why they are lobbying to remove the requirement.

And furthermore, this bill doesn't just remove barriers to sending natural gas to our allies in Europe or in Japan, for example. It removes barriers to sending even more natural gas to China, which, given the -- and just given the conversation that our colleague Mrs. Fletcher was just having, I am surprised anybody would support it.

The bill is nothing more than a giveaway to the natural gas special interests. It doesn't protect us and bring down the cost of energy here at home. And it would do the opposite. And for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill, and I yield back.

3230 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you. The gentlewoman yields. Is

there anyone else that wishes to be recognized? 3231 *Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the 3232 3233 desk. 3234 *Mr. Curtis. Okay. Let me first go to the gentlewoman from Texas, Mrs. Fletcher. 3235 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I will 3236 *Mrs. Fletcher. try to be brief. I raised some of these issues in the 3237 context of the last bill, but I just want to raise a couple 3238 3239 of issues here. I don't support this bill. While I do support the 3240 export of American LNG and, in fact, would love to talk more 3241 about that on this committee, I think that the system that we 3242 are talking about here, while perhaps -- I definitely hear 3243 some of the concerns about the time for these permit 3244 approvals, but I think what we need to remember is that these 3245 particular approvals apply only to exports to countries where 3246 we do not already have a free trade agreement. 3247 Those are automatically deemed in the national interest. 3248 3249 So we are talking about facilities and permits relating

3250 to exports to countries where getting that input from the 3251 Department of Energy, I think, is still important. And in 3252 fact, this was the argument I made when we were talking about

exports from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, that we should have a process like this and have DoE involved. It is something this committee took up years ago, before I was here, but I think that that is actually what we should be doing.

And what I think we can do is, rather than basically gut 3258 the provisions to do this review, we should look at expanding 3259 it. In the last Congress I introduced a bill called the 3260 3261 American Gas for Allies Act. We are working on a reintroduction of that bill -- and I would love for this 3262 committee to take it up -- that expands the provisions here 3263 that expedite the process for countries that we have a free 3264 trade agreement with to our allies and partners in Europe who 3265 3266 we do not have free trade agreements with, but who are helping fight Russia's unprovoked and unconscionable brutal 3267 war in Ukraine. 3268

I think there are things that we can do that are smart to help get this gas onto the market, where it is needed right now, but I don't support gutting all of the provisions, as this bill does. And so I am going to vote against this bill.

3274 Thank you, I will yield back.

3275	*Mr. Curtis. The gentlewoman yields. Is there anyone
3276	else that wishes to speak to the bill?
3277	If not
3278	*Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I do have an amendment at
3279	the desk.
3280	*Mr. Curtis. Is your amendment bipartisan?
3281	*Mr. Johnson. I know it is in it is amendment No. 3.
3282	*Mr. Curtis. We are just taking bipartisan amendments
3283	first is the only reason I ask.
3284	*Mr. Johnson. Oh, that is fine.
3285	*Mr. Curtis. All right. Seeing none, the gentleman is
3286	recognized.
3287	*Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3288	This amendment makes two points of clarification. It is
3289	
	amendment No. 3, by the way.
3290	amendment No. 3, by the way. *The Clerk. Would the chair like me to report?
3290 3291	
	*The Clerk. Would the chair like me to report?
3291 3292	*The Clerk. Would the chair like me to report? *Mr. Curtis. Please, yes, thank you.
3291 3292	*The Clerk. Would the chair like me to report? *Mr. Curtis. Please, yes, thank you. *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1130, offered by Rep.
3291 3292 3293	<pre>*The Clerk. Would the chair like me to report? *Mr. Curtis. Please, yes, thank you. *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1130, offered by Rep. Johnson. Page 2, line 8, strike "Commission,' ` and insert</pre>

3297
3298
3299 [The amendment of Mr. Johnson follows:]
3300
3301 *******COMMITTEE INSERT********
3302

3303 *Mr. Curtis. And the gentleman is recognized for five 3304 minutes in support of the amendment.

*Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment makes two points of clarification which were identified as helpful by DoE, FERC, and other stakeholders that would benefit from this legislation and its goal to move the -remove the regulatory burdens and barriers to LNG imports and exports. The amendment does two things.

3311 First, it makes clear that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, not DoE, will have the exclusive authority to 3312 make application decisions under the provisions of this bill. 3313 This preserves the current role of FERC, and avoids confusion 3314 with DoE's authority under the DoE Organization Act. 3315 This means FERC will continue to approve or deny applications for 3316 the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a 3317 facility to export or import natural gas, pursuant to section 3318 3 of the Natural Gas Act. It will continue to lead on NEPA 3319 reviews. 3320

3321 Second, the amendment adds the clarification that, when 3322 FERC conducts its application reviews, it shall deem the 3323 exportation and importation of natural gas as consistent with 3324 the public interest. This provision clarifies that there

will be no restrictions on the export of natural gas as a 3325 commodity, as it is in the public interest. The underlying 3326 purpose of this bill is to remove burdensome red tape on the 3327 exportation of natural gas. This follows the policy this 3328 committee advanced in H.R. 702 in 2015, which removed the 3329 Commerce Department fully from restricting crude oil exports 3330 to the benefit of the nation and the world, as we have since 3331 learned. 3332 3333 So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and continue the positive policies that we need to advance our 3334 goal of global leadership and provide affordable, clean 3335 energy here at home and abroad. 3336 And with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman. 3337 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you. 3338 3339 The gentleman yields. Is there further discussion on the amendment? 3340 *Mr. Pfluger. Yes, Mr. Chairman. 3341 *Mr. Curtis. Yes, the gentleman from Texas is --3342 3343 *Mr. Pfluger. I move to strike the last word. *Mr. Curtis. The gentleman is recognized. 3344 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, you know, 3345 I think it is an important discussion here. 3346

What we are talking about is actually helping. You 3347 know, I have heard on the other side of the aisle, even in 3348 today in this discussion, helping Ukraine, helping our 3349 3350 allies, helping -- well, with those countries that we don't have a free trade agreement with -- and I had an LNG 3351 expansion act bill last year, and this is very similar --3352 this actually does help. It actually does move at the speed 3353 of relevancy, which the business world is moving at. And 3354 3355 unfortunately, government is moving in an archaic pace.

And we are -- so I hear from my colleagues that we want to be able to help. Well, this is a way we can help countries like Moldova, who are facing a dire shortage of LNG right now, today. And they have asked us for help, and yet we can't get out of our own way to approve it.

This is not a Big Oil giveaway. I am not sure how many more times we are going to hear that point today. I am sure it is numerous. This is not only helping our own country, but it is helping our allies.

3365 So for those on the other side of the aisle, let's have 3366 the discussion. And actually, today is the time to have that 3367 discussion. Where are the amendments to help improve this 3368 from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle? Where are

3369 the amendments to help make these bills what you would want 3370 them to be?

You just asked, Mr. Chairman, where are the bipartisan amendments to this. We agree with part of it, but not the others, but yet there is no amendments? I am sorry. If you don't come to the markup with an amendment that makes it what you want, then we kind of get to the point where this is a good amendment, it helps our own industry here, and it helps our allies.

3378 With that, I yield back.

3379 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you. The gentleman yields.

3380 Seeing no further discussion, the vote occurs on the 3381 amendment.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

3383 All those opposed?

3384 The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

3385 *Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman?

3386 *Mr. Curtis. Is -- yes. Are there any other

amendments?

3388 Yes, Mr. Pallone seeks to be recognized.

3389 *Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the 3390 desk, No. SCD02.

3391	*Mr. Curtis. The clerk will report the amendment.
3392	*The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1130, offered by Rep.
3393	Pallone. Add -
3394	*Mr. Curtis. Without objection, the reading of the
3395	amendment is dispensed.
3396	[The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]
3397	
3398	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
3399	

3400 *Mr. Curtis. And the gentleman is recognized for five 3401 minutes in the support of his amendment.

*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment is 3402 3403 straightforward. It simply says that the bill shall not take effect until the Secretary of Energy certifies that increased 3404 LNG exports from the United States will not increase domestic 3405 natural gas prices. Many of my constituents use natural gas 3406 to heat their homes, and the high prices they have seen over 3407 3408 the past two winters due to Putin's invasion of Ukraine have been difficult for families throughout New Jersey. 3409

When we had our joint subcommittee hearing three weeks 3410 ago, we heard from Mr. Tyson Slocum, who testified about how 3411 increased LNG exports tie U.S. natural gas prices to higher 3412 3413 and more volatile international prices. According to the Saint Louis Fed, European natural gas prices averaged just 3414 under \$20 per unit in January, and that is roughly 6 times 3415 more expensive than natural gas prices here in the United 3416 States. 3417

3418 So I am worried and my constituents are worried that 3419 this bill would only serve to increase the price of natural 3420 gas in the United States. We are not the only ones. The 3421 Industrial Energy Consumers of America also urged opposition

to the bill on the grounds that excessive LNG exports can increase natural gas prices and volatility, leaving Americans on the hook while Big Oil and Gas profits by selling LNG at inflated prices.

LNG exports exploded by 2,000 percent from 2016 to 2022. 3426 U.S. natural gas prices increased by 155 percent over that 3427 same timeframe. And when an explosion at the Freeport LNG 3428 export facility in Texas shut down the facility, domestic 3429 3430 natural gas prices immediately fell by 10 percent, because gas that was set to be exported from that facility was now 3431 going to stay in the United States market. And that was not 3432 a coincidence. 3433

So my point is, if my friends on the other side of the 3434 aisle dispute that the bill would result in higher natural 3435 gas prices, then they should be happy to vote for this 3436 amendment, as in that case then the Secretary could make her 3437 certification on the day the bill would be enacted, and it 3438 could go into effect. But if, as I think we all know they 3439 3440 do, LNG exports do increase domestic natural gas prices, then this amendment would be a vital safequard to ensure that 3441 Americans are not ripped off by Big Oil and Gas. 3442

And so I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back

3444 at this time, Mr. Chairman.

3445 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you.

3446 The gentleman yields. Is there a discussion on the 3447 amendment?

3448 *Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman?

3449 *Mr. Curtis. Does the gentleman wish to be recognized?
3450 *Mr. Johnson. I strike the last word to speak in

3451 opposition.

3452 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you. The gentleman is recognized.
3453 *Mr. Johnson. LNG exports lower emissions, strengthen
3454 energy security, create jobs, and decrease energy prices here
3455 at home.

The whole point of my legislation is to remove 3456 regulations on the exportation and importation of natural gas 3457 to assure Americans can realize the benefits of increased 3458 production and supply. This amendment would do exactly the 3459 opposite, imposing a broad economic regulation on exports, 3460 which will add to uncertainty, curtail market signals 3461 3462 essential for increased production, and lead to higher prices. Restricting LNG exports would mean higher prices at 3463 home for Americans. It reduces the amount in the global 3464 market, which puts an upward pressure on prices. 3465

As I said in my opening remarks on this legislation, the 3466 3467 issue is not limited natural gas reserves in this country, because we have plenty, more than enough to go around. 3468 3469 And also, I have to say, it is rich coming from my colleagues in the minority, saying that they now are 3470 concerned about Americans suffering with high natural gas 3471 bills. I have a hard time believing the sincerity of this 3472 concern when, for years now, we have seen Democrats' entire 3473 3474 legislative and regulatory agenda built upon rush-to-green initiatives that make this type of energy so expensive that 3475 people will stop using it. 3476

My friends and colleagues, we need to pursue policies to unleash American resources, to deliver clean, affordable, and reliable energy to Americans, and project American geostrategic power abroad. We need more production to lower prices, not stifling regulations and continued restrictions. So I urge a no vote on this amendment, and a yes vote on the underlying bill, and I yield back.

3484 *Mr. Curtis. Is there further discussion on the 3485 amendment?

3486 The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

3487 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The United States

3488 began exporting liquefied natural gas from the U.S. lower 48 3489 states in February of 2016. Natural gas prices are naturally 3490 volatile. However, the average price between 1996 and March 3491 2016 was \$4.47. Since LNG exports began, the average price 3492 has been \$3.52.

If there was ever a normal period for LNG exports and prices, I would say it was from January 2017 to March of 2020, the time just before COVID kicked in, and when LNG exports were quickly ramping up. During this period prices averaged \$2.82, and LNG exports roughly increased by a factor of 4.

At Biden's inauguration in January of 2021, prices were \$2.71. LNG exports were around 11 billion cubic feet per day. Today LNG exports are about 13 billion cubic feet per day, and today's spot price was \$2.43. Prices are lower than when he was inaugurated, and shipments were 15 percent higher.

3505 So what I contend is that history shows us that 3506 increasing LNG exports does not increase the natural gas 3507 prices at home. I oppose the amendment.

3508 *Mr. Curtis. The gentlewoman yields. If there is no 3509 further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment.

3510	And all those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
3511	Okay, I all those opposed?
3512	The nays have it.
3513	*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, can I ask for the yeas and
3514	nays?
3515	*Mr. Curtis. Yes. On that, a requested roll call vote.
3516	The clerk will call the roll.
3517	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
3518	[No response.]
3519	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta?
3520	*Mr. Latta. No.
3521	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes no.
3522	Rep. Guthrie?
3523	[No response.]
3524	*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith?
3525	[No response.]
3526	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
3527	*Mr. Johnson. No.
3528	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes no.
3529	Rep. Bucshon?
3530	*Mr. Bucshon. [Inaudible.]
3531	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes no.
	167

3532	Rep.	Walberg?)	
3533	*Mr.	Walberg.	No.	
3534	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Walberg votes no.
3535	Rep.	Palmer?		
3536	*Mr.	Palmer.	No.	
3537	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Palmer votes no.
3538	Rep.	Curtis?		
3539	*Mr.	Curtis.	[Ina	audible.]
3540	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Curtis votes no.
3541	Rep.	Lesko?		
3542	*Mrs.	Lesko.	No.	
3543	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Lesko votes no.
3544	Rep.	Pence?		
3545	*Mr.	Pence.	No.	
3546	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Pence votes no.
3547	Rep.	Armstron	ıg?	
3548	[No r	esponse.]	
3549	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Weber?
3550	[No r	esponse.]	
3551	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Balderson?
3552	*Mr.	Baldersc	on. N	10.
3553	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Balderson votes no.
				168

3554	Rep.	Pfluger?			
3555	*Mr.	Pfluger.	[Ir	naudible.]	
3556	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Pfluger votes no.	
3557	Rep.	Rodgers?			
3558	*The	Chair.	[Inau	udible.]	
3559	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Rodgers votes no.	
3560	Rep.	Duncan?			
3561	*Mr.	Duncan.	[Ina	audible.]	
3562	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Duncan votes no.	
3563	Rep.	DeGette?			
3564	*Ms.	DeGette.	[Ir	naudible.]	
3565	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	DeGette votes aye.	
3566	Rep.	Peters?			
3567	*Mr.	Peters.	[Ina	audible.]	
3568	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Peters votes aye.	
3569	Rep.	Fletcher	?		
3570	*Mrs	. Fletche	er. A	Ауе.	
3571	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Fletcher votes aye.	
3572	Rep.	Matsui?			
3573	*Ms.	Matsui.	Aye.		
3574	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Matsui votes aye.	
3575	Rep.	Tonko?			

3576	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
3577	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes aye.
3578	Rep. Veasey?
3579	[No response.]
3580	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?
3581	[No response.]
3582	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier?
3583	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
3584	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes aye.
3585	Rep. Castor?
3586	[No response.]
3587	*The Clerk. Rep. Sarbanes?
3588	[No response.]
3589	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
3590	*Mr. Cardenas. [Inaudible.]
3591	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes aye.
3592	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
3593	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
3594	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes aye.
3595	Rep. Pallone?
3596	*Mr. Pallone. [Inaudible.]
3597	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes aye.

3598		*Mr. Guthrie. No.
3599		*The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes no.
3600		*Mr. Griffith. Griffith votes no.
3601		*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes no.
3602		Rep. Armstrong?
3603		*Mr. Armstrong. No.
3604		*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes no.
3605		Rep. Weber?
3606		*Mr. Weber. No.
3607		*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes no.
3608		*Mr. Duncan. [Presiding] Any other member not recorded?
3609		The clerk will report the total.
3610		[Pause.]
3611		*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 9 ayes
3612	and 2	l6 noes.
3613		*Mr. Duncan. The noes have it. The amendment is not
3614	agree	ed to.
3615		So the pending question is forwarding H.R. 1130 to the
3616	full	committee.
3617		All those in favor will say aye?
3618		Those opposed, no.
3619		And the ayes have it.
		151

3620	*Voice. A recorded vote, Mr. Chair.
3621	*Mr. Duncan. A recorded vote has been requested. The
3622	clerk will call out the roll.
3623	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
3624	[No response.]
3625	
3626	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta?
3627	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
3628	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
3629	Rep. Guthrie?
3630	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
3631	*The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes aye.
3632	Rep. Griffith?
3633	[No response.]
3634	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson?
3635	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
3636	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
3637	Rep. Bucshon?
3638	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
3639	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon votes aye.
3640	Rep. Walberg?
3641	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.

3642	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.
3643	Rep. Palmer?
3644	[No response.]
3645	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis?
3646	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
3647	*The Clerk. Rep. Curtis votes aye.
3648	Rep. Lesko?
3649	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
3650	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
3651	Rep. Pence?
3652	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
3653	*The Clerk. Rep. Pence votes aye.
3654	Rep. Armstrong?
3655	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
3656	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes aye.
3657	Rep. Weber?
3658	[No response.]
3659	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson?
3660	*Mr. Balderson. [Inaudible.]
3661	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.
3662	Rep. Pfluger?
3663	*Mr. Pfluger. [Inaudible.]
	150

3664	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Pfluger votes aye.
3665	Rep.	Rodgers	?	
3666	*The	Chair.	[Inau	udible.]
3667	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Rodgers votes aye.
3668	Rep.	Duncan?		
3669	*Mr.	Duncan.	Aye	
3670	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Duncan votes aye.
3671	Rep.	DeGette	?	
3672	*Ms.	DeGette	. No	
3673	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	DeGette votes no.
3674	Rep.	Peters?		
3675	[No]	response	•]	
3676				
3677	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Fletcher?
3678	*Mrs	. Fletche	er.	[Inaudible.]
3679	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Fletcher votes no.
3680	Rep.	Matsui?		
3681	*Ms.	Matsui.	No.	
3682	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Matsui votes no.
3683	Rep.	Tonko?		
3684	*Mr.	Tonko.	No.	
3685	*The	Clerk.	Rep.	Tonko votes no.
				174

3686	Rep. Veasey?
3687	[No response.]
3688	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?
3689	[No response.]
3690	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier?
3691	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
3692	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes no.
3693	Rep. Castor?
3694	[No response.]
3695	*The Clerk. Rep. Sarbanes?
3696	[No response.]
3697	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
3698	*Mr. Cardenas. No.
3699	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.
3700	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
3701	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. [Inaudible.]
3702	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes no.
3703	Rep. Pallone?
3704	*Mr. Pallone. [Inaudible.]
3705	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.
3706	*Mr. Duncan. Is any member not recorded?
3707	Mr. Griffith?

3708	*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Griffith votes yes.
3709	*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes aye.
3710	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Palmer recorded?
3711	*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.
3712	*Mr. Palmer. [Inaudible.]
3713	*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.
3714	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Peters recorded?
3715	*The Clerk. Mr. Peters is not recorded.
3716	*Mr. Peters. No.
3717	*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
3718	*Mr. Duncan. Any other member not recorded?
3719	Mr how is Mr. Weber recorded?
3720	*Mr. Weber. Weber votes aye.
3721	*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes aye.
3722	*Mr. Duncan. Any other members?
3723	The clerk will report the total.
3724	[Pause.]
3725	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 16 ayes
3726	and 9 noes.
3727	*Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it. The bill is agreed to,
3728	and will be sent to full committee.
3729	The chair will now call up H.R. 1115, and ask the clerk
	176

to report. 3730 3731 *The Clerk. H.R. 1115 to provide for Federal and state agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations 3732 3733 under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes. *Mr. Duncan. Without --3734 *The Clerk. Section 1 --3735 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of 3736 the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for 3737 3738 amendment at any time. So ordered. 3739 [The bill follows:] 3740 3741 3742 3743

*Mr. Duncan. Any bipartisan amendments to be offered? 3744 3745 The chair will recognize Mr. Balderson to explain the bill. 3746 3747 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. H.R. 1115 would also establish a deadline of 90 days 3748 after FERC has completed a NEPA review for Federal 3749 authorization of a project, and requires FERC to notify 3750 Congress if that deadline will not be met. 3751 3752 If passed, H.R. 1115 would guarantee accountability and 3753 transparency from FERC during a coordinated Federal, state, and local NEPA review process to ensure growth and security 3754 for America's energy sector. 3755 I am also offering an amendment to H.R. 1115. This 3756 3757 amendment simply sets deadlines on FERC to identify, invite, and designate agencies that it must cooperate with in the 3758 pipeline permit review process. 3759 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3760 *Mr. Duncan. Any further discussion? 3761 3762 Mr. Cardenas is recognized. *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like 3763 to strike the last word on H.R. 115 [sic]. 3764 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized. 3765 178

*Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak in 3766 3767 opposition of H.R. 115 [sic], the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act. 3768 3769 There is a growing body of research that shows exposure to fossil fuel pollution is linked to negative health 3770 Time and time again, science has told us that oil, 3771 impacts. gas, and coal activity poison our air and water, and 3772 contribute to the climate crisis. To protect the health of 3773 3774 our communities and to combat climate change, we must be thoughtful and and intentional about the legislation we 3775 consider. 3776

Not only does this bill fail to pivot to a more 3777 sustainable energy model, but it cuts out the very 3778 communities that have borne the brunt of pollution. 3779 This is deeply -- this is a deeply flawed bill, and would approve 3780 without proper consideration the construction of new natural 3781 gas pipelines, and undermine critically necessary 3782 environmental review processes. It undercuts public 3783 3784 transparency and input from communities, and codifies into statute deadlines to shut out every agency, apart from the 3785 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, from this process. 3786 When FERC testified in front of the -- this subcommittee 3787

3788 years ago on this bill, it laid out many of these concerns, 3789 concerns that have not been addressed in the last six years 3790 since. Not a word of this bill has changed since it passed 3791 the House in 2017 only to die in the Republican-controlled 3792 Senate.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle today may 3793 claim that they have gone through regular order, but regular 3794 order should not be a series of items on a list that can be 3795 3796 mindlessly ticked off. It should be a process of good faith engagement on a bill, which has been lacking here in this 3797 This bill, amongst many others today, only shows us 3798 case. that our Republican colleagues are willing to push through 3799 poor policy and sacrifice the well-being of the American 3800 3801 people so that Big Oil executives can reap more profits.

Again, we know the impacts that reckless fossil fuel expansion has on our communities, especially those that have been historically left behind. We cannot be so reckless with this -- with the health and well-being of the American people, and we most certainly cannot be so reckless with the future of our children and grandchildren.

3808 If Republicans are serious about wanting to engage on 3809 ideas that can help build cleaner energy faster, I would
advise them to work with all of us on this committee. Until 3810 then, I urge opposition of this bill, and I yield back, Mr. 3811 Chairman. 3812 3813 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any further discussion on the bill? 3814 Mr. Palmer from Alabama is recognized. For what purpose 3815 do you seek recognition? 3816 *Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak in 3817 support of the bill, and, you know, I am going to keep 3818 pounding this point: hydrocarbons are essential to human 3819 prosperity. 3820 We keep hearing this dogma or propaganda about how much 3821 damage has been done. I have -- this is government data 3822 3823 here. I mentioned earlier that, even though our economy has grown 142 percent since 1970, CO2 emissions have gone down 32 3824 percent, overall emissions of the 6 criteria gases that the 3825 EPA tracks have gone down 86 percent -- I want to point out, 3826 though, that -- how the hydrocarbon energy impacts whole 3827 3828 countries. In the Human Index Development -- Human Development 3829

3830 Index, India moved from low to medium on that index. But let 3831 me tell you what that means. Because they built out -- they

began to build out their energy infrastructure, education 3832 3833 increased by 2.2 times, and the life expectancy increased by 11.8 years. China did the same thing. They moved from low 3834 3835 to high in the Human Development index, Mr. Chairman, and their energy -- their life expectancy increased 7.8 years. 3836 Now, does that sound like hydrocarbon-based energy is 3837 destructive to the human condition? Does it sound like it is 3838 compromising human prosperity? 3839

We have got nearly three billion people worldwide that don't have access to adequate energy resources that we could meet with natural gas. There is 900 million people in sub-Saharan Africa that don't have access to electricity, they are cooking their food with -- indoors, with things like cow dung. But we want to deny them natural gas.

I argued on this committee and previous committees for 3846 two or three years for the people in Pembroke Township in 3847 Illinois to get natural gas. It is a town of 2,100 people, 3848 85 percent of whom are African American. They were heating 3849 3850 their homes with propane and wood, cooking their food with propane. I am happy to report, through the efforts of Jesse 3851 Jackson and other key civil rights leaders, that Pembroke 3852 Township now has a natural gas pipeline. 3853

3854	It is essential to human prosperity, to the improvement
3855	of the human condition, and I am really astonished at the
3856	rhetoric that I continue to hear that makes it sound as
3857	though this is a horrible thing for the people of this
3858	country, especially when, as I have reported earlier, there
3859	is 20 million people behind on their
3860	*Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield?
3861	*Mr. Palmer the utilities.
3862	*Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield?
3863	*Mr. Palmer. Happily.
3864	*Mr. Duncan. Thank you. You make some great points.
3865	There are so many people around the world who can't keep food
3866	fresh, who cook and heat their homes or their domiciles with
3867	wood, even animal dung. The air quality in those homes is
3868	pretty low.
3869	Through the export of American LNG, which we have an
3870	abundance of natural gas in this country, export of that to,
3871	as you pointed out, sub-Sahara Africa and other places around
3872	the globe will definitely improve the quality of life for
3873	those people. We have an abundance to meet all of our energy
3874	needs here in America, and the ability to export that.
3875	This bill is well thought-out, and is the right thing to

3876 do, and I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out, and I 3877 yield back.

*Mr. Palmer. My last point on this is there is a 3878 3879 village in India where Greenpeace went in. They got -invested some money to build a microgrid -- renewable grid 3880 for this little village called Dharnai. And they supposedly 3881 would make this little village energy independent. They are 3882 now using those facilities for cattle sheds because, as we 3883 3884 all know, these things don't last forever, and they couldn't afford to replace them. But even when they had it, Mr. 3885 Chairman, they didn't generate enough power, to your point, 3886 to run refrigerators, or water pumps, things that are 3887 absolutely essential to the wellbeing of people. 3888

And as I pointed out earlier, we want to move people into the modern world, into a modern economy. And frankly, again, I am just astonished at what I am hearing from people in our attempts to try to maintain our economic security and our national security by strengthening our hydrocarbon power grid.

3895 I yield back.

3896 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any further 3897 discussion?

3898 *Mr. Weber. Mr. Chairman?

3899 *Mr. Duncan. Mr. Weber is recognized.

3900 *Mr. Weber. I move to strike the last words. Thank 3901 you, Mr. Chairman.

In Alex Epstein's book, "The Moral Case for Fossil 3902 Fuels,' ' he actually lays out the fact, Mr. Palmer, that what 3903 we do provides people in less -- less fortunate people in 3904 those under-developed countries with adequate energy that 3905 3906 helps -- actually helps the women and the girls the most, because they spend so much of their time having to walk to 3907 the river or their source of water, the females do. 3908 Thev spend so much of their time cooking, having to go get food 3909 every day because they don't have refrigeration -- in fact, 3910 he makes the case in his book that most of those households 3911 have the amount of electricity that is equal to one -- a year 3912 that is equal to the amount of energy it takes to run one of 3913 our refrigerators. 3914

3915 So they are severely under-developed countries. They 3916 need fossil fuel to get out of the Dark Ages. We are trying 3917 to help. And I join my colleague from Alabama in saying I 3918 don't understand why all the pushback on our ability to help 3919 those downtrodden people in those countries.

3920	And so with that, Mr. Chairman, I want my colleagues,
3921	hopefully, to support this, and I yield back.
3922	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any other
3923	further discussion?
3924	The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for the purpose of
3925	offering an amendment.
3926	*Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an
3927	amendment at the desk.
3928	*Mr. Duncan. The clerk will report the amendment.
3929	*The Clerk. Can the member please specify the
3930	amendment?
3931	*Mr. Balderson. It is amendment No. 012.
3932	*The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1115, offered by Rep.
3933	Balderson. Page 3, beginning on line 23, strike "as early as
3934	practicable after it is notified by a person applying for,' '
3935	and insert, "not later than 30 days after the Commission
3936	receives an application for.'
3937	Page 4, line 9, strike "the' ` and insert "not later than
3938	45 days after the Commission receives an application for an
3939	authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, or a
3940	Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity under section
3941	7 of such act, the.'`
	104

3942	Page 4, line 19, strike "the' ` and insert "not later
3943	than 60 days after the Commission receives an application for
3944	an authorization under section' '
3945	*Mr. Duncan. Further of the amendment is dispensed
3946	with.
3947	[The amendment of Mr. Balderson follows:]
3948	
3949	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
3950	

3951	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized to
3952	explain the amendment.
3953	*Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This
3954	amendment simply sets deadlines on FERC to identify, invite,
3955	and designate agencies it must cooperate with in the pipeline
3956	permit review process.
3957	*Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman. Any further
3958	discussion on the amendment?
3959	Seeing none, the pending question is approval of the
3960	amendment, adoption of the amendment.
3961	All those in favor, say aye.
3962	Any opposed?
3963	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The
3964	amendment is agreed to.
3965	Now the pending question is adoption of the bill, as
3966	amended.
3967	Yes, Mr. Tonko, for what purpose do you seek
3968	recognition?
3969	*Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.
3970	I believe it is numbered AMDT02.
3971	*Mr. Duncan. The clerk will report the amendment.
3972	*The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1115, offered by Rep.
	188

3973	Tonko. Beginning on page 5, strike line 10 and all that
3974	follows through page 6, line -
3975	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the reading of the
3976	amendment is dispensed with.
3977	[The amendment of Mr. Tonko follows:]
3978	
3979	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
3980	

*Mr. Duncan. And now we will discuss the amendment. 3981 3982 Mr. Tonko is recognized to explain the amendment. *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. In my view, if we 3983 3984 want to get energy infrastructure of any type built more quickly, it starts by having more consultation with impacted 3985 communities earlier in the process, not less. This gives 3986 everyone a fair chance to understand a potential project, its 3987 benefits and its drawbacks, and make an informed decision on 3988 whether or not and under which conditions to lend their 3989 3990 support.

This legislation broadly suffers from the misquided 3991 thinking, in my view, that limiting processes for community 3992 engagement and environmental review is the best way to get 3993 these projects built. So while I broadly have concerns with 3994 the bill, my amendment would narrowly focus on one paragraph 3995 that I hope members can agree is doing a disservice to our 3996 state, local, and tribal partners that have such an important 3997 role to play in project permitting. 3998

3999 Subsection D of H.R. 1115 requires that FERC identify 4000 what the bill calls participating agencies: any Federal or 4001 state agency, along with any local or tribal governments that 4002 have a say in pipeline authorizations through a specific

4003 community.

However, subsection d(f) of the bill then goes on to say that any agency not identified by FERC gets zero say in the environmental review process, even if it will play a major role in authorizing a pipeline, and should be brought in from the beginning of the process.

Under the bill, non-designated agencies cannot request 4009 that additional information be included in an environmental 4010 4011 review. They are actually specifically forbidden from carrying out a supplemental environmental review. And 4012 perhaps most eqregiously, FERC is prohibited from considering 4013 any of their comments on an environmental review, and from 4014 even including those comments in the record. 4015

Surely we can all see how this opens up potential for abuse. Even the most well-intentioned bureaucracy may not correctly identify every single local, state, or tribal agency involved in pipeline approvals. The bill, as written, does not care if FERC makes a mistake. A non-designated agency is unable to have its comments and expertise included in FERC's process.

This could also go downhill quickly if, for political reasons, agencies were purposefully left off the list of

4025 designated agencies. Then FERC would be free to ignore their 4026 comments and render its environmental review as it saw fit, 4027 potentially without feedback from the state, from the local 4028 or tribal agencies with the most connection and information 4029 to the actual site in question.

My amendment is simple. It would delete the part of the 4030 bill that puts restrictions on non-designated agencies. It 4031 does not impact FERC's ability to designate and coordinate 4032 4033 with agencies it identifies. It just removes the prohibitions on agencies that are not designated. 4034 I think this is a common-sense amendment that will ensure state, 4035 local, and tribal agencies are not left out of environmental 4036 4037 review for permitting decisions that directly affect their 4038 communities.

And with that, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment --

4041 *Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

4042 *Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I yield back.

4043 *Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

4044 *Mr. Tonko. Yes, I will.

4045 *Ms. DeGette. I thank the gentleman. I support the 4046 gentleman's amendment.

And I also -- I don't want to dwell on it, but I just 4047 want to say very briefly, with respect to this comment about 4048 women and girls in third-world countries need fossil fuels 4049 4050 for cooking, you know, study after study has shown that climate change just vastly disproportionately impacts third-4051 world countries in negative ways. And it is true that women, 4052 girls, villages, everybody needs energy in third-world 4053 countries. But the evidence is not clear -- in fact, it is 4054 to the contrary -- that they need fossil fuels, which will 4055 only exacerbate climate change. 4056

And so I would say this is part of what I think we 4057 should do. Rather than just going through the old, tired 4058 talking points about about energy policy, we should work 4059 together across the aisle to capitalize on American 4060 ingenuity, try to find energy sources that will work not just 4061 in the U.S., but around the world that we can export to help 4062 improve everybody's situation, and not exacerbate climate 4063 change. 4064

4065 And I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I yield back 4066 to him.

4067 *Mr. Tonko. And I yield back.

4068 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Any further

4069 discussion?

4070 Mr. Palmer is recognized.

4071 *Mr. Palmer. And again, I just want to point out that 4072 the World Health Organization estimates that using indoor 4073 cooking, as they do in sub-Saharan Africa, having to cook 4074 indoors with wood, or food debris, or cow dung was linked to 4075 nearly 500,000 premature deaths.

I don't think those -- that -- when you have that many 4076 4077 people dying because they don't have access to reliable energy, that they would be all that concerned about climate 4078 I don't think for them that is the existential 4079 change. There is 900 million people in sub-Saharan Africa 4080 threat. That is one out of -- that is five of six people that 4081 alone. 4082 don't have access to reliable energy.

4083 *The Chair. Would the gentleman yield?

4084 *Mr. Palmer. Absolutely.

4085 *The Chair. Would the gentleman speak to the role 4086 natural gas has played in bringing down carbon emissions 4087 worldwide and in the United States of America?

4088 *Mr. Palmer. Happily. As I pointed out, that --4089 because the United States conversion from coal-fired energy 4090 generation to natural gas, we have reduced CO2 emissions by

4091 32 percent.

4092 But I want to go back to what it means to third-world countries to get reliable power. When you look at India, 4093 4094 with its population about to exceed that of China's, and the condition of that country, and they have added over 11 years 4095 to life expectancy as they have increased their access to 4096 power, access to reliable energy is foundational to human 4097 prosperity, to human health. And I don't think there is any 4098 4099 way to dispute that.

4100 *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield?

4101 *Mr. Palmer. Absolutely.

4102 *Mr. Duncan. I read an article recently about a much-4103 heralded project in India, where a solar farm was created. 4104 The whole village was going to be on renewable energy. In 4105 about a year's time that system was non-functional. Money 4106 wasn't available to upgrade it, and batteries were failing. 4107 They switched back to coal-fired power plants.

There is a lot of research and other things that need to go on in order to make renewables actually work for places that you mentioned -- Sub-Saharan Africa, India, and other places -- that if renewables can be part of it, I am all for it. But we know what works. We know that natural gas can

4113 provide the needed power, and it can be transported and put 4114 in huge tanks for the small village to power their generators 4115 and refrigerators or whatnot to improve the quality of life 4116 of people around the globe.

And the twist to it is we have an abundance of natural 4117 gas in this country, so much that it is not even measurable, 4118 really. They try. We have enough gas to meet all of our 4119 energy needs here in America, and export it to help others 4120 4121 around the globe, the millions, hundreds of millions, that you mentioned. We should be doing that. We should be doing 4122 that, producing that natural gas here and exporting it to 4123 help folks live better lives, healthier lives around the 4124 4125 globe.

4126 I yield back.

4127 *Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with your comments, and it might be of some value at some point for 4128 this committee to take a congressional delegation trip to 4129 Sub-Saharan Africa and some of these places and perhaps let 4130 4131 our colleagues across the aisle explain to them why they shouldn't have access to reliable energy, and then let them 4132 explain to us why, if we are not going to be in the business 4133 of providing it, they will turn to the communist Chinese to 4134

- do it, because China is doing that. The Communist Chinese 4135 4136 Party is investing itself, investing in these energy infrastructure, and they are doing it through coal. 4137 4138 So I think it would be a difficult argument to make to these 900 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa who are having 4139 to cook indoors with things that pollute the indoor air and 4140 that are killing half a million people over since -- over the 4141 last five years. I think that number is since 2018. 4142 4143 *The Chair. Would the gentleman yield? 4144 *Mr. Palmer. Yes, ma'am. *The Chair. I think another aspect of this, because we 4145 are advocating for an all-of-the-above, we believe that we 4146 need to unleash American energy, natural gas, oil, hydro, 4147 nuclear, wind, solar, batteries. 4148 4149 But I mentioned in my opening comments China is the one that controls the green energy materials. You know, they 4150 have been termed the OPEC of green materials. You know, 70 4151 percent of cobalt and lithium, 90 percent of rare earth 4152 4153 minerals. We have also talked about the mines in Congo. Ι think we all need to recognize that some of the realities 4154
- 4155 around any source of energy.
- 4156 And I yield back.

*Mr. Palmer. I will just add this before I yield. 4157 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time has expired. 4158 *Mr. Palmer. I realize my time has expired, but not one 4159 4160 time have we said we are against renewables. Not one time. I yield back. 4161 The gentleman's time has expired. 4162 *Mr. Duncan. Anv further discussion? 4163 Mr. Cardenas of California is recognized. 4164 4165 *Mr. Cardenas. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Assuming we are still on the amendment, I would like to move to strike 4166 the last word on the amendment. 4167 I just want to state for the record, a lot of truths 4168 have been mentioned by some of my colleagues on the 4169 Republican side of the aisle, but what I do want to correct 4170 for the record is that a lot of examples of micro situations, 4171 where certain communities or certain projects try to go to 4172 renewable energy or what have you, and found that renewable 4173 energy or processes on their own did not work out very well, 4174 4175 I don't know the details of the projects, the ultimate details of the projects that were just mentioned, but there 4176 are failures in American history and world history on energy, 4177 and many other examples where bad design or great intentions 4178

but bad implementation has resulted in bad results. 4179 4180 But what I do want to state for the record, and I would love for us to have the debate, and even bring our military 4181 4182 leaders before us, because even our military leaders are telling the United States Congress -- and they have said it 4183 more than once on the record -- that the number-one threat to 4184 peace on earth is the climate change that is occurring where 4185 more and more people across America and around the world are 4186 4187 experiencing bad climate crises that are forcing people to migrate away from where they want to live and where they 4188 naturally live, and that is the biggest threat to world 4189 4190 peace.

And even our own military recognizes that they have to change their ways and be less dependent on fossil fuel, not 100 percent no longer dependent on fossil fuel, but less dependent on fossil fuel because of the adverse effects that the byproducts of fossil fuels causes on the world climate.

So I would love to have that debate, but I just thought it was important for us to put into context that, yes, on any given day, anybody in any committee in Congress or any conversation in some coffeehouse across America can point to some bad projects, projects right here in America, projects

4201	anywhere in the world where bad design, bad implementation
4202	results in "Aha, it didn't work.' ' But let me tell you, even
4203	our own United States military says that the number-one
4204	threat to our safety in our country and peace on the planet
4205	has to do with climate change.
4206	*Mr. Pfluger. Will the gentleman
4207	*Mr. Cardenas. Even they admit that they are having to
4208	clean up their act.
4209	*Mr. Pfluger. Will the gentleman yield?
4210	*Mr. Cardenas. Yes, I will.
4211	*Mr. Pfluger. Mr. Cardenas, I am just going to have to
4212	push back just a little bit on that statement. I am still
4213	serving in the military, as a Reserve colonel. I have never
4214	heard that. The number-one threat coming from our military
4215	leaders is China.
4216	And we recently had a witness that sat here and said air
4217	knows no boundaries. And yet just this week, China has
4218	already announced the continuation and, in fact, the increase
4219	of their coal-fired plants.
4220	And to a previous point, if we are really concerned
4221	about the climate, then what we should be doing is exporting

200

4222 our own good air. Over the last 6 or 7 years, we have

decreased those emissions, as was previously mentioned for for CO2, 32 percent, while we have increased LNG production tenfold on the export side.

Additionally, methane, when you look at the decrease in the reduction of methane emissions, it is 14 percent.

So I want us to work together on energy, and how we produce electricity, and what we do. But I do not think that there is any military leader out there that is saying anything about the largest existential threat to our country from a military standpoint is climate change. I think that is false.

4234 *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, Mr. Pfluger. I am not going 4235 to argue that China is one of the biggest threats to our 4236 national security and security on Earth. But it is not 4237 mutually exclusive.

And yes, I would love for this committee or any committee of Congress to call the leaders of our military forward and ask them specific questions about China and/or about climate change and what it is doing to the cause of migration of people around the planet. And as was mentioned earlier, some of the most -- the people on the planet who are threatened the most by climate change, and who need to find

4245 better solutions for their energy needs are, in fact, the 4246 poorest people on the planet.

And so I look forward to that opportunity for us to have that debate and that discussion with the folks that you have mentioned and I have mentioned, as well. And thank you for your service.

4251 *Mr. Griffith. Mr. Chairman?

4252 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time has expired. The 4253 chair will recognize Mr. Griffith from Virginia for five 4254 minutes.

4255 *Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we are 4256 talking past each other.

Is -- when we talk about climate change as the number-4257 one problem in the world, and it is going to bring 4258 instability to the planet, it is like we can't use fossil 4259 fuels to effect a positive result on climate change. And it 4260 drives me crazy, because we have roughly 300 million people 4261 in India that don't have reliable power, we have people in 4262 4263 Sub-Saharan Africa that don't have reliable power. They have dirty coal. They have coal they can mine. 4264

The Chinese are not only building plants -- as Mr. Pfluger pointed out -- in their own country, they are

4267 building them in Sub-Saharan Africa to help those people.
4268 They are garnering goodwill all over the world using
4269 antiquated technology, when we in this country not only have
4270 better technology, we are constantly working on better
4271 technology.

Recently, I went to visit with some folks who are 4272 associated or part of Consol Energy. It was exciting because 4273 the methane leaking out of existing coal mines and abandoned 4274 4275 coal mines can be captured by this new technology they have. And if we really are serious about solving the climate 4276 issues, and reducing the amount of natural gas and CO2 4277 methane that escapes and CO2 in the air, we should be using 4278 American technology to make the use of our fossil fuels 4279 4280 better and better.

And then we can export our technology, not antiquated 4281 technology from China using 1960s and 1970s technology, but 4282 21st century technology that the United States can produce 4283 and give or sell, whichever is the right way to do it, to 4284 4285 countries in the world who are just trying to make sure that their folks have the power to heat their homes if they need 4286 them, to provide cooking abilities, to provide them with 4287 modern technologies, because they are all going to be using -4288

- they are all using these smartphones. We need to be 4289 providing that, instead of it being provided by antiquated 4290 technology by the Chinese. 4291

4292 And so we are -- it is not that we don't agree that we need to be looking at how we reduce greenhouse gases, it is 4293 that we ought not throw out the baby with the bathwater and 4294 say we can't use fossil fuels, that we can only use 4295 renewables. We need to be using all of the above where it is 4296 4297 appropriate to use solar and wind, whether it be here or in the third world or somewhere else. That is fine. 4298

But where it is appropriate to use ways to clean up the 4299 dirty coal they already have, we have that technology 4300 available, too. We are already selling some of that to India 4301 4302 to try to help them with steel production. There are so many different things that we could be doing, and our companies 4303 are hamstrung, their hands are tied so that they cannot do as 4304 much as they would like to do and invest in new investments 4305 which will help the world and help the U.S. economy. 4306

4307 I appreciate your time, Mr. Chairman, and I will yield to somebody else or yield back to you, whichever is 4308 preferable. 4309

4310

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

*Mr. Weber. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I move to 4311 strike the last words. 4312 Regarding the comments about -4313 4314 *Mr. Duncan. Griffith's got the time. He was just yielding you the time. You got enough time? 4315 *Mr. Griffith. Yes. 4316 *Mr. Weber. Regarding the comments from the other side 4317 of the aisle that we on this side of the aisle are picking 4318 4319 out isolated incidences of little tiny micro electrical systems and then saying they are failing, it is kind of 4320 interesting to me because I am from Texas. Twenty percent of 4321 our wind -- of our energy is wind energy. Five percent is 4322 solar panels. 4323 This last really hard winter February two years ago, of 4324 course, we found out windmills ice up, solar panels ice up. 4325 They get clouded up, they have snow on them, and they failed 4326 not in a micro sense, but on a huge sense because Texas has 4327 -- 85 percent of its state is in ERCOT, its own power grid. 4328 4329 So the argument somehow that this is just simply a micro grid doesn't hold water. 4330

And I just want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, as has been said here, but I think it bears repeating in this

4333	format, and that is this. We want renewables. We are for
4334	renewables, but renewables cannot be the leading actor in
4335	this play. Renewables can be a supporting actor in this
4336	play, but we are going to need fossil fuels, the President
4337	thinks, for another 10 years. Bless his heart, he is on the
4338	right track. He is just about 100 years short.
4339	And I just want to say that this notion that somehow we
4340	are choosing isolated instances is just false on its face.
4341	We have experienced that, first and foremost, two years ago.
4342	We know what fossil fuels are. We know what renewables are.
4343	Renewables are good. This has been said for many, many
4344	years. We need all of the above.
4345	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time has expired.
4346	*Mr. Weber. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4347	*Mr. Duncan. The clock was reset prematurely.
4348	We have have about 15 minutes before votes are called on
4349	the floor. So does anyone else want to speak on the
4350	amendment?
4351	Mr. Balderson, quickly.
4352	*Mr. Balderson. No, Mr. Chairman, I just want to move
4353	to strike the last word.

This amendment would significantly alter FERC's ability

4355	to serve as the lead agency in the natural gas pipeline
4356	review process, which is the intent of this bill.
4357	And I would yield if Mr. Burgess, the author of the
4358	legislation, would like to speak. Go right ahead. I yield
4359	to you, Mr. Burgess.
4360	*Mr. Duncan. Mr. Walberg wanted some time, as well.
4361	*Mr. Burgess. In the interest of time, I have nothing
4362	meaningful to add to this conversation. I think we should
4363	defeat the amendment and move on, go to the floor, and vote.
4364	But I will yield to Mr. Walberg.
4365	*Mr. Walberg. In the essence of time, I will save my
4366	speech for another day.
4367	*Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman.
4368	If there is not any further discussion on the amendment,
4369	the question is adoption of Mr. Tonko's amendment.
4370	And all those in favor, say aye.
4371	Those opposed, no.
4372	In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.
4373	A recorded vote has been requested. The clerk will call
4374	the roll.
4375	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
4376	*Mr. Burgess. [Inaudible.]
	207

4377	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes no.
4378	Rep. Latta?
4379	*Mr. Latta. No.
4380	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes no.
4381	Rep. Guthrie?
4382	[No response.]
4383	*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith?
4384	*Mr. Griffith. Votes no.
4385	*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes no.
4386	Rep. Johnson?
4387	[No response.]
4388	*The Clerk. Rep. Bucshon?
4389	[No response.]
4390	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg?
4391	*Mr. Walberg. No.
4392	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes no.
4393	Rep. Palmer?
4394	*Mr. Palmer. [Inaudible.]
4395	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes no.
4396	Rep. Curtis?
4397	[No response.]
4398	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko?

4399	*Mrs. Lesko. No.
4400	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes no.
4401	Rep. Pence?
4402	[No response.]
4403	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong?
4404	*Mr. Armstrong. No.
4405	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes no.
4406	Rep. Weber?
4407	*Mr. Weber. No.
4408	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes no.
4409	Rep. Balderson?
4410	*Mr. Balderson. No.
4410	*Mr. Balderson. No. *The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no.
4411	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no.
4411 4412	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no. Rep. Pfluger?
4411 4412 4413	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no. Rep. Pfluger? [No response.]
4411 4412 4413 4414	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no. Rep. Pfluger? [No response.] *The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers?
4411 4412 4413 4414 4415	<pre>*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no. Rep. Pfluger? [No response.] *The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers? *The Chair. [Inaudible.]</pre>
4411 4412 4413 4414 4415 4416	<pre>*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no. Rep. Pfluger? [No response.] *The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers? *The Chair. [Inaudible.] *The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes no.</pre>
4411 4412 4413 4414 4415 4416 4417	<pre>*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes no. Rep. Pfluger? [No response.] *The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers? *The Chair. [Inaudible.] *The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes no. Rep. Duncan?</pre>

4421	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
4422	*The Clerk. Rep. DeGette votes aye.
4423	Rep. Peters?
4424	[No response.]
4425	*The Clerk. Rep. Fletcher?
4426	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
4427	*The Clerk. Rep. Fletcher votes aye.
4428	Rep. Matsui?
4429	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
4430	*The Clerk. Rep. Matsui votes aye.
4431	Rep. Tonko?
4432	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
4433	*The Clerk. Rep. Tonko votes aye.
4434	Rep. Veasey?
4435	[No response.]
4436	*The Clerk. Rep. Kuster?
4437	[No response.]
4438	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier?
4439	*Ms. Schrier. [Inaudible.]
4440	*The Clerk. Rep. Schrier votes aye.
4441	Rep. Castor?
4442	[No response.]

4443	*The Clerk. Rep. Sarbanes?
4444	[No response.]
4445	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
4446	*Mr. Cardenas. Aye.
4447	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes aye.
4448	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
4449	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
4450	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes aye.
4451	Rep. Pallone?
4452	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
4453	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes aye.
4454	*Mr. Duncan. Any members not recorded?
4455	Mr. Peters, how is Mr. Peters recorded?
4456	*The Clerk. Mr. Peters is not recorded.
4457	*Mr. Peters. [Inaudible.]
4458	*The Clerk. Rep. Peters votes aye.
4459	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Guthrie recorded?
4460	*The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie is not recorded.
4461	*Mr. Guthrie. [Inaudible.]
4462	*The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes no.
4463	*Mr. Duncan. How is Mr. Johnson recorded?
4464	*The Clerk. Mr. Johnson is not recorded.

4465	*Mr. Johnson. Johnson votes no.
4466	*The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes no.
4467	*Mr. Duncan. Any further members not recorded?
4468	The clerk will report the total.
4469	[Pause.]
4470	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 9 ayes
4471	and 13 noes.
4472	*Mr. Duncan. The noes have it, the amendment is not
4473	agreed to.
4474	The pending question is adoption of the bill, as
4475	amended.
4476	A recorded vote?
4477	All those in favor, say aye.
4478	Those opposed, no.
4479	The ayes have it.
4480	She asked for a recorded vote, so the clerk will call
4481	the roll.
4482	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess?
4483	*Mr. Burgess. [Inaudible.]
4484	*The Clerk. Rep. Burgess votes aye.
4485	Rep. Latta?

4487	*The Clerk. Rep. Latta votes aye.
4488	Rep. Guthrie?
4489	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
4490	*The Clerk. Rep. Guthrie votes aye.
4491	Rep. Griffith?
4492	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
4493	*The Clerk. Rep. Griffith votes aye.
4494	Rep. Johnson?
4495	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
4496	*The Clerk. Rep. Johnson votes aye.
4497	Rep. Bucshon?
4498	[No response.]
4499	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg?
4500	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
4501	*The Clerk. Rep. Walberg votes aye.
4502	Rep. Palmer?
4503	*Mr. Palmer. [Inaudible.]
4504	*The Clerk. Rep. Palmer votes aye.
4505	Rep. Curtis?
4506	[No response.]
4507	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko?
4508	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.

4509	*The Clerk. Rep. Lesko votes aye.
4510	Rep. Pence?
4511	[No response.]
4512	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong?
4513	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
4514	*The Clerk. Rep. Armstrong votes aye.
4515	Rep. Weber?
4516	*Mr. Weber. Aye.
4517	*The Clerk. Rep. Weber votes aye.
4518	Rep. Balderson?
4519	*Mr. Balderson. [Inaudible.]
4520	*The Clerk. Rep. Balderson votes aye.
4521	Rep. Pfluger?
4522	[No response.]
4523	*The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers?
4524	*The Chair. Aye.
4525	*The Clerk. Rep. Rodgers votes aye.
4526	Rep. Duncan?
4527	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
4528	*The Clerk. Rep. Duncan votes aye.
4529	Rep. DeGette?
4530	*Ms. DeGette. [Inaudible.]

4531	*The Clerk.	Rep.	DeGette votes no.
4532	Rep. Peters?		
4533	[No response.	.]	
4534	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Fletcher?
4535	*Mrs. Fletche	er. 1	10.
4536	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Fletcher votes no.
4537	Rep. Matsui?		
4538	*Ms. Matsui.	No.	
4539	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Matsui votes no.
4540	Rep. Tonko?		
4541	*Mr. Tonko.	No.	
4542	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Tonko votes no.
4543	Rep. Veasey?		
4544	[No response.	.]	
4545	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Kuster?
4546	[No response.	.]	
4547	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Schrier?
4548	*Ms. Schrier.	. [Ir	naudible.]
4549	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Schrier votes no.
4550	Rep. Castor?		
4551	[No response.	.]	
4552	*The Clerk.	Rep.	Sarbanes?

4553	[No response.]
4554	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas?
4555	*Mr. Cardenas. [Inaudible.]
4556	*The Clerk. Rep. Cardenas votes no.
4557	Rep. Blunt Rochester?
4558	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. [Inaudible.]
4559	*The Clerk. Rep. Blunt Rochester votes no.
4560	Rep. Pallone?
4561	*Mr. Pallone. No.
4562	*The Clerk. Rep. Pallone votes no.
4563	*Mr. Duncan. Are there any members not recorded?
4564	The clerk will report the total.
4565	[Pause.]
4566	*The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote we have 13 ayes
4567	and 8 noes.
4568	*Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill, as
4569	amended, H.R. 1115, will be sent to the full committee.
4570	The chair now calls up H.R. 1160, and asks the clerk to
4571	report.
4572	*The Clerk. H.R. 1160, to direct the Secretary of
4573	Energy to promulgate regulations to facilitate the timely
4574	submission of notifications regarding cybersecurity incidents

4575	and potential cybersecurity incidents with respect to
4576	critical electric infrastructure, and for other purposes.
4577	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
4578	the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for
4579	amendment at any time.
4580	So ordered.
4581	[The bill follows:]
4582	
4583	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
4584	

*Mr. Duncan. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the 4585 4586 bill? Any other amendments to the bill? 4587 4588 The chair will now recognize Mr. Walberg to explain his bill. 4589 *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. H.R. 1160, the 4590 Critical Electric Infrastructure Cybersecurity Incident 4591 Reporting Act, would amend the Federal Power Act to identify 4592 4593 the Department of Energy as a designated agency to receive notifications regarding cybersecurity incidents with respect 4594 to critical electric infrastructure. 4595 Cyber attacks on energy infrastructure reached record 4596 highs in 2022. We are facing a dangerous combination. 4597 Nation states and bad actors are getting better at targeting 4598 our critical energy assets, while our energy grid is aging 4599 and becoming more vulnerable. We only had a glimpse of how 4600 damaging an energy sector cyber attack could be when Colonial 4601 Pipeline suffered a ransomware attack in 2021. Forty-five 4602 4603 percent of pipeline operators were affected. More than 17 states declared a state of emergency, and consumers were hit 4604

4605 with higher gas prices due to supply shortage.

Just this past week, over 900,000 consumers in southern

4607 Michigan after a Wednesday ice storm lost power. My home, as 4608 well. Ninety thousand consumers are still without power as 4609 of last night. A widespread attack on our electric grid 4610 would even be more devastating.

Department of Energy was established by the FAST Act as the right agency when it comes to energy cybersecurity. The legislation would direct the agency to develop regulations that will add more clarity on the scope and scale of cybersecurity incidents that require reporting.

It also charges them with establishing procedures for reporting potential cybersecurity incidents. These actions will help companies quickly respond to increasing attacks and install preventative measures.

I understand there have been some concerns about potential duplication of reporting requirements. But this is just the first step in the committee process for a bill.

4623 Cybersecurity is a national security issue and, most 4624 importantly, it has critical assets which require the 4625 attention of experts across the Federal Government to ensure 4626 Americans are safe.

I want to thank Representative Schrier for joining me in introducing this legislation. I look forward to working with

her, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and industry 4629 to improve the bill before we move to the full committee. 4630 I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation so 4631 4632 that we can continue the conversation and move it forward in the committee process. 4633 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 4634 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. The chair will 4635 now go to the cosponsor of the bill, Ms. Schrier, for five 4636 4637 minutes. *Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank 4638 Mr. Walberg for working with me on this. And when it comes 4639 to our national security, cybersecurity is a major concern, 4640 as you just pointed out. 4641 Broadly, Department of Homeland Security manages these 4642 4643 threats, and is the point agency. But our energy systems are

different. Power plants, the electric grid are high-risk, prime targets, as we have already seen, and as Mr. Walberg just pointed out. So when it comes to our critical electric infrastructure, we really need the expertise and involvement of the Department of Energy, and they have got to play a key role.

4650 We recently had a legislative hearing on this bill. It

4651 has bipartisan support.

4652 I would just like to flag, along with my colleague, that this is one step in a longer process, and stakeholder 4653 4654 feedback is critical. So I am committed, along with Mr. Walberg and the other members of this committee, to ensure 4655 that we can properly protect the cybersecurity of our power 4656 system, and ensure the Department of Energy has the 4657 appropriate key place at the table because of their expertise 4658 4659 when it comes to energy transmission and grid nuance. So again, we are getting more feedback from stakeholders 4660 whose input we didn't have at the beginning. And I have 4661 heard from many of the utilities in Washington State about 4662 their concerns. And I think we can find the right balance 4663 and protect our grid. 4664

4665 Thank you very much. I yield back.

4666 Oh, I yield to Mr. Cardenas.

4667 *Mr. Cardenas. Will the gentlewoman yield? I want to 4668 say something nice.

4669 [Laughter.]

4670 *Mr. Cardenas. I would like to thank Congressman

4671 Walberg and Congresswoman Schrier, Dr. Schrier, for working 4672 together on this. This is a perfect example of what we can

do together when we do cooperate, when we do give each other enough time and respect to dialogue and agree and disagree or what have you.

4676 I think it is nine bills that we are hearing today, but here we have a bill that is bipartisan. And hopefully, we 4677 can get back to more of those days with -- where we can have 4678 -- I remember in this committee, early on when I got on this 4679 committee, we didn't hear about it in the press, but we had 4680 4681 marked up 41 bills that day. One bill was withdrawn. And if I think my memory serves me correctly, there was one bill 4682 where it wasn't bipartisan, and 39 bills were fully 100 4683 percent bipartisan, a yes vote by every Democrat and every 4684 Republican on this committee. 4685

So hopefully, we can get back to those days and, hopefully, we can all, Republicans and Democrats, trumpet bills like this one and -- when we do find ourselves working together for the American people and also to improve the world. I just wanted to say thank you. And on a positive note, this is a great bill. Thank you.

4692 *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentlelady yield? I just want 4693 you to notice for the record how far apart the representative 4694 and I are. So all of you in between ought to come together

easily on this bill. 4695 4696 [Laughter.] *Ms. Schrier. Yes, and yet how close we are at the same 4697 4698 time. I yield back. The gentlelady yields back. Any further 4699 *Mr. Duncan. discussion? 4700 Mrs. Lesko, you are recognized for five minutes. 4701 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you. I move to strike the last 4702 4703 word. 4704 As was mentioned specifically, the American Public Power Association had written me a letter and -- with some 4705 concerns. And so I look forward to working with the sponsors 4706 4707 to see if we can mitigate those concerns. And with that, I yield back. 4708 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. 4709 If no further discussion, we will now move to vote. 4710 All those in favor of passage to the full committee will 4711 say aye. 4712 4713 Any opposed? And the ayes have it. 4714 So that concludes the markup, nine bills, and I am glad 4715 we did, Tony, end on a positive note. So thanks for pointing 4716

4717 that out.

4718 *Mr. Cardenas. Mr. Chairman, when would be the time to announce submitting an article for the record? 4719 I ask unanimous consent to submit for the record an 4720 article: "Defense Secretary Calls Climate Change an 4721 Existential Threat,' ' dated April 22nd, 2021, article written 4722 4723 by David Verhagen, and I forwarded it to the staff already. *Mr. Duncan. Without objection. 4724 [The information follows:] 4725 4726 4727 4728

*Mr. Cardenas. Thank you so much.
*Mr. Duncan. Without objection, staff is authorized to
make technical and conforming changes to legislation approved
by the subcommittee today.
So ordered.
Without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 1:31 p.m., the subcommittee was

4736 adjourned.]