

**Statement of the Honorable Jerrold Nadler on HR 3592—The Protect
LNG Act of 2025
Full Committee
Markup**

Wednesday, September 10, 2025, 10:00 a.m.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This bill would exempt liquified natural gas, or LNG, from the laws we have passed to protect people from the health and environmental impacts of fossil fuels like LNG. LNG is just a new name for a fossil fuel created through fracking. This bill would remove the ability to challenge fracking fuel export sites, raise concerns with the health impacts of such sites, or even seek judicial relief.

Today, the Republicans want to exempt fracking from our environmental laws not out of concern for our environment, but to protect big oil and gas companies.

Today, we will hear Republicans claim that we need to exempt approvals for fracking fuel export sites because we need more export sites to stay competitive. But our own government found, just 10 months ago, that we already have more than enough export sites to meet global demand for LNG for decades to come.

Today, we will hear Republicans claim that building out sites for exporting this fracked fuel is necessary for our economy. Again, this is not true. The federal government's own reports show that increased export of fracked gas will increase utility bills, raise consumer prices, and increase domestic manufacturing costs. In short, more LNG exports means more money for the oil and gas industry while families and small businesses pay the price through higher energy bills.

We may hear Republicans today say that these LNG export sites are good for the local economy. This also is untrue. Construction of LNG export sites may create short-term jobs, but once construction is complete, the facility creates very few long-term jobs. In fact, once a new site is constructed, the site and its detrimental impacts endanger local jobs like those of the Gulf Coast fishermen and those whose jobs are dependent on the fishing industry. In addition, LNG export sites are invariably placed in poor areas that are home to mostly Black and Hispanic communities. They are poor before a site is built, and they remain poor afterwards, but have more ill health effects from the increased pollution.

Republicans might also claim today that this fuel is greener and cleaner than other traditional fossil fuels, and thus a helpful bridge fuel for regions to rely on before they have fully built out renewable energy. This is also not true.

LNG is a result of fracking and is a fossil fuel. It is dirtier than coal and even less green. And our fracking fuel exports not only have a huge impact on climate change on their own, but most often replace renewable and cleaner energy sources.

So why exempt this one type of fuel from the laws we passed to protect our health and the health of our environment? I say we shouldn't. But we have not even had a chance to debate the merits of this bill because we have not had a hearing on it. Nor have we had a chance to debate the environmental and health effects of the Administration's puzzling and unexplained hostility to cheap and green wind energy.

But, of course, this is just the latest example of how Republicans are motivated to protect big oil at our collective expense. Take, for instance, the so-called Big Ugly Bill. We all know that this bill cuts the health care of millions of Americans while giving the rich large tax cuts. But it is not so well-known that the Big Ugly Bill also increases handouts to the fossil fuel industry by four billion dollars. These handouts, of course, also come at the expense of renewable energy projects supported by Democrats. While you struggle to pay your electricity bill, Republicans are making sure that big oil and gas continue to rake in record profits.

If we can take one thing away from this markup, it is this: Republicans want to exempt a fuel that can poison the air we breathe and the water we drink from the safety laws we have passed to protect against those very dangers. A vote for the Protect LNG Act is a vote for big oil and gas at the expense of the public's health.

Republicans are acting to exempt LNG from reporting requirements because they do not want us to know the dangers. To know that if you live near a fracking fuel site, you are more likely to suffer from asthma or cancer than the average American. Exposure to the emissions from LNG sites means you are less likely to survive your pregnancy, and your kids will be more likely to have worse health and worse school performance. The pollutants from LNG sites raise your chances of developing lung disease, asthma, blood disorders, heart disease, and incurring lifelong impairment to your thinking and memory. Schools near fracking fuel export sites have toxic air exposure levels higher than 95 percent of other schools in the nation.

At every step of the production chain, fracking fuel development has profound and damaging impacts on our health and the health of our environment. And Republicans want to exempt this one type of fuel from the environmental laws Congress passed to protect against these harms.

The Republicans voting to support this bill are voting for harming our children, polluting our air and water, and hurting our wildlife. Republicans are voting to protect a fuel that is dirtier than even coal, worse for our environment than coal, and disadvantages people who are already suffering from the huge health impacts these fracking facilities cause. Even outside of the profound impacts these sites have on our health and on the environment, Republicans want to place LNG site approvals above the law, and above the courts, to eliminate any means to get justice and to oppose these sites being placed near our homes and our kids.

The Republicans who vote for this bill will pocket more donations from big oil, big gas, and big fracking, while your family faces cancer, asthma, blood disorders, and worse caused by this fracking fuel.

For all these reasons I oppose the Protect LNG Act, and I yield back.