

UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL
ACT OF 2025

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. GUTHRIE, from the Committee on Energy and Commerce,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1949]

The Committee on Energy and Commerce, to whom was referred
the bill (H.R. 1949) to repeal restrictions on the export and import
of natural gas, having considered the same, reports favorably
thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose and Summary	2
Background and Need for Legislation	2
Committee Action	4
Committee Votes	4
Oversight Findings and Recommendations	7
New Budget Authority, Entitlement Authority, and Tax Expenditures	7
Congressional Budget Office Estimate	7
Federal Mandates Statement	7
Statement of General Performance Goals and Objectives	7
Duplication of Federal Programs	7
Related Committee and Subcommittee Hearings	7
Committee Cost Estimate	9
Earmark, Limited Tax Benefits, and Limited Tariff Benefits	9
Advisory Committee Statement	9
Applicability to Legislative Branch	9
Section-by-Section Analysis of the Legislation	9
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	9
Minority, Additional, or Dissenting Views	13
Exchange of Letters with Additional Committees of Referral	

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

H.R. 1949, the “Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2025,” was introduced by Representative Pfluger (R-TX) on March 6, 2025. The legislation would lift all restrictions on the import and export of natural gas, with limited exceptions to limit trade with a person or foreign country under sanction or listed as a state sponsor of terrorism.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Since the first-ever export of liquified natural gas (LNG) from the lower-48 states in February 2016,¹ the United States has emerged as the world’s number one producer of oil and natural gas, and a leading exporter of LNG, contributing to enhanced energy security, economic growth, and diplomatic leverage.

In 2023 alone, the U.S. LNG industry contributed \$44 billion in economic activity, supported 222,000 jobs, reduced the trade deficit, and provided \$11 billion in taxes and royalty payments.² These benefits will only grow as LNG exports are projected to contribute roughly \$1.3 trillion to the economy by 2040.³

Under current law, any person wishing to import or export U.S. natural gas must obtain multiple Federal and State permits, undergoing a rigorous regulatory review. Applicants must obtain authorization to import or export the commodity, natural gas, and must also obtain approval to construct and operate the LNG facility.

The Committee has found that some aspects of the regulatory review are duplicative and unnecessary, which has contributed to delays and introduced regulatory uncertainty that has stifled economic growth and job development. For example, under the Natural Gas Act (NGA),⁴ applicants must complete an environmental and safety review of a proposed LNG export facility with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) before DOE will consider whether to grant authorization to export natural gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement countries, even though there is a clear statutory presumption that LNG exports are in the public interest. The NGA does not require a separate public interest determination in the case exports to countries where a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) is in effect; however, even while the statute requires DOE to issue authorization “without modification or delay,” DOE routinely waits months to issue FTA authorizations.⁵ Furthermore, in *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County, Colorado*, the Supreme Court of the United States recently held that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) only applies to the direct impacts of a

¹ EIA, *Natural Gas Weekly Update*, U.S. Energy Information Administration (Feb. 24, 2016), https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/weekly/archivenew_ngwu/2016/02_25/.

² National Association of Manufacturers, *Quantifying America’s Economic and Energy Opportunity through LNG Exports*, NAM (Oct. 2024), <https://nam.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/Quantifying-Americas-Economic-and-Energy-Opportunity-through-LNG-Exports.pdf>.

³ U.S. Chamber of Commerce Energy, *U.S. Chamber: Comprehensive New S&P Global Analysis Demonstrates Importance of LNG Exports*, U.S. Chamber of Commerce (Dec. 17, 2024), <https://www.uschamber.com/energy/u-s-chamber-comprehensive-new-s-p-global-analysis-demonstrates-importance-of-lng-exports#:~:text=%E2%80%9CThe%20research%20conducted%20by%20S&P.fuel%20resources%20from%20other%20countries.>

⁴ 15 U.S.C. §§ 717–717z.

⁵ 15 U.S.C. § 717b.

proposed project itself, not separate or indirect effects of a project.⁶ This 8–0 decision reaffirms the importance of eliminating duplicative and unnecessary reviews of projects.

In January 2024, President Biden announced an indefinite moratorium on the issuance of export permits to non-FTA countries while it conducted a review of the climate impacts of natural gas.⁷ Prior to this announcement, DOE had already commissioned five studies to examine the effects of U.S. LNG exports.⁸ The results unanimously demonstrated the benefits to the U.S. economy and domestic natural gas prices. In fact, despite total U.S. natural gas consumption nearly doubling from 2010 to 2023, the 2023 average natural gas price of \$2.54 per MMBtu was the second-lowest level in over 35 years.⁹

The Committee has determined that natural gas should not be subject to burdensome and unnecessary trade restrictions, and that the regulatory framework for natural gas should be harmonized with that of petroleum products and crude oil. In 2015, Congress recognized the need to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions and repealed all restrictions on the export of crude oil on a bipartisan basis. Lifting the restrictions on the export of crude oil encouraged additional domestic energy production, created American jobs, and economic development, and allowed the U.S. to emerge as the leading oil producer in the world.¹⁰ In 2019, the U.S. became a net exporter of petroleum products for the first time since 1952, and the reliance of the U.S. on foreign imports of petroleum products has declined to historic lows.¹¹ Additionally, LNG and crude oil exports have played significant roles in lowering the U.S. trade deficit.

H.R. 1949 would remove restrictions on the import and export of natural gas, by eliminating the need for an applicant to apply to DOE for authorization to import or export the commodity. Under H.R. 1949, FERC would maintain exclusive authority to approve or deny an application for the siting, construction, operation, or expansion of a facility to import or export natural gas. The Committee does not intend for H.R. 1949 to affect the existing FERC procedures to the review of the facility or change any standards for environmental or safety review. However, H.R. 1949 directs FERC to deem the export or import of natural gas to be consistent with the public interest. The Committee intends for the scope of FERC’s review to be limited to the facility itself, and not to extend upstream or downstream beyond those effects that are direct or reasonably foreseeable.

⁶*Seven Cnty. Infrastructure Coal. v. Eagle Cnty., Colorado*, 145 S. Ct. 1497, 221 L. Ed. 2d 820 (2025).

⁷Presidential Statement on Decision to Pause Pending Approvals of Liquefied Natural Gas Exports 2024, Daily Comp. Pres. Doc. (Jan. 26, 2024).

⁸Dept. of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy, 83 FR 27314, *Study on Macroeconomic Outcomes of LNG Exports* (June 12, 2018).

⁹American Petroleum Institute (API), *Estimated Value Added from LNG Price Differential*, API (Mar. 18, 2024), <https://www.api.org/-/media/files/news/2024/03/18/api-eva-lng-price-full-report>.

¹⁰ICF, *The Economic Benefits of Lifting the U.S. Crude Oil Export Ban: A Retrospective Analysis*, API (July 2022), <https://www.api.org/-/media/files/news/2022/07/25/economic-benefits-of-crude-oil-exports-retrospective>.

¹¹Bill Sanchez, *U.S. total energy exports exceed imports in 2019 for the first time in 67 years*, U.S. Energy Information Administration (Apr. 20, 2020), <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=43395#:~:text=In%202019%2C%20the%20United%20States%20continued%20to,coke%2C%20natural%20gas%2C%20petroleum%20products%2C%20and%20biomass>.

The Committee finds that free trade, open markets, and competition have contributed to the rise of the U.S. as a global energy superpower. The Committee expects that lifting restrictions on the import and export of natural gas would contribute to net economic benefits, increased natural gas production, and improved energy security and national security for the American people and partners around the world.

COMMITTEE ACTION

On April 30, 2025, the Subcommittee on Energy held a legislative hearing on 14 pieces of legislation, including H.R. 1949. The Subcommittee received testimony from:

- Mike Goff, Acting Undersecretary of Energy, U.S. Department of Energy;
- David L. Morenoff, Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;
- Terry Turpin, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;
- Jim Matheson, Chief Executive Officer, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association;
- Amy Andryszak, President and Chief Executive Officer, Interstate Natural Gas Association of America;
- Todd A. Snitchler, President and Chief Executive Officer, Electric Power Supply Association and;
- Kim Smaczniak, Partner, Roselle LLP.

On June 5, 2025, the Subcommittee on Energy met in open markup session and forwarded H.R. 1949, without amendment, to the full Committee by a record vote of 15 yeas and 13 nays. On June 25, 2025, the full Committee on Energy and Commerce met in open markup session and ordered H.R. 1949, without amendment, favorably reported to the House by a record vote of 26 yeas and 23 nays.

COMMITTEE VOTES

Clause 3(b) of rule XIII requires the Committee to list the record votes on the motion to report legislation and amendments thereto. The following reflects the record votes taken during the Committee consideration:

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY
119TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL VOTE # 15**

BILL: H.R. 1949, Unlocking Our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2025

AMENDMENT: Approved favorably to the Full Committee (Final Passage)

DISPOSITION: Agreed to, by a roll call vote of 15 yeas to 13 nays.

REPRESENTATIVE	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT	REPRESENTATIVE	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
Mr. Latta	X			Ms. Castor		X	
Mr. Weber	X			Mr. Peters		X	
Mr. Palmer	X			Mr. Menendez		X	
Mr. Allen	X			Mr. Mullin		X	
Mr. Balderson	X			Ms. McClellan		X	
Mr. Pfluger	X			Ms. DeGette		X	
Mrs. Harshbarger	X			Ms. Matsui		X	
Mrs. Miller-Meeks				Mr. Tonko		X	
Mr. James	X			Mr. Veasey		X	
Mr. Bentz	X			Ms. Schrier		X	
Mr. Fry	X			Ms. Fletcher		X	
Ms. Lee				Ms. Ocasio-Cortez		X	
Mr. Langworthy	X			Mr. Auchincloss			
Mr. Rulli				Mr. Pallone		X	
Mr. Evans	X						
Mr. Goldman	X						
Mrs. Fedorchak	X						
Mr. Guthrie	X						

06/05/2025

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
119TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL VOTE # 20**

BILL: H.R. 1949, Unlocking Our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2025

AMENDMENT: Final Passage

DISPOSITION: Agreed to, by a roll call vote of 26 yeas and 23 nays.

REPRESENTATIVE	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT	REPRESENTATIVE	YEAS	NAYS	PRESENT
Mr. Guthrie	X			Mr. Pallone		X	
Mr. Latta	X			Ms. DeGette		X	
Mr. Griffith	X			Ms. Schakowsky		X	
Mr. Bilirakis				Ms. Matsui		X	
Mr. Hudson	X			Ms. Castor		X	
Mr. Carter (GA)	X			Mr. Tonko		X	
Mr. Palmer	X			Ms. Clarke		X	
Mr. Dunn	X			Mr. Ruiz		X	
Mr. Crenshaw	X			Mr. Peters		X	
Mr. Joyce	X			Mrs. Dingell		X	
Mr. Weber	X			Mr. Veasey		X	
Mr. Allen	X			Ms. Kelly		X	
Mr. Balderson	X			Ms. Barragán		X	
Mr. Fulcher	X			Mr. Soto		X	
Mr. Pfluger	X			Ms. Schrier		X	
Mrs. Harshbarger	X			Ms. Trahan		X	
Mrs. Miller-Meeks	X			Ms. Fletcher		X	
Mrs. Cammack	X			Ms. Ocasio-Cortez			
Mr. Obernolte	X			Mr. Auchincloss		X	
Mr. James	X			Mr. Carter (LA)		X	
Mr. Bentz	X			Mr. Menendez		X	
Mrs. Houchin				Mr. Mullin		X	
Mr. Fry	X			Mr. Landsman		X	
Ms. Lee				Ms. McClellan		X	
Mr. Langworthy							
Mr. Kean	X						
Mr. Rulli	X						
Mr. Evans	X						
Mr. Goldman	X						
Mrs. Fedorchak	X						

06/25/2025

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII, the Committee held hearings and made findings that are reflected in this report.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY, ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY,
AND TAX EXPENDITURES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII, the Committee finds that H.R. 1949 would result in no new or increased budget authority, entitlement authority, or tax expenditures or revenues.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII, at the time this report was filed, the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was not available.

FEDERAL MANDATES STATEMENT

The Committee adopts as its own the estimate of Federal mandates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 423 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII, the general performance goal or objective of this legislation is to remove restrictions on the import and export of U.S. LNG.

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(5) of rule XIII, no provision of H.R. 1949 is known to be duplicative of another Federal program, including any program that was included in a report to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139 or the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

RELATED COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(6) of rule XIII, the following related hearing was used to develop or consider H.R. 1949:

On February 5, 2025, the Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing on H.R. 1949. The title of the hearing was “Powering America’s Future: Unleashing American Energy.” The Subcommittee received testimony from:

- Amanda Eversole, Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy Officer, American Petroleum Institute;
- Brigham McCown, Senior Fellow and Director, Initiative on American Energy Security, The Hudson Institute;
- Gary Arnold, Business Manager, Denver Pipefitters Local 208 and;
- Tyler O’Connor, Partner, Crowell & Moring LLP.

On March 5, 2025, the Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing on H.R. 1949. The title of the hearing was “Scaling for Growth: Meeting the Demand for Reliable, Affordable Electricity.” The Subcommittee received testimony from:

- Todd Brickhouse, CEO and General Manager, Basin Electric Power Cooperative;
- Asim Haque, Senior Vice President for Governmental and Member Services, PJM;
- Noel W. Black, Senior VP of Regulatory Affairs, Southern Company and;
- Tyler H. Norris, James B. Duke Fellow, Duke University.

On March 25, 2025, the Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing on H.R. 1949. The title of the hearing was “Keeping the Lights On: Examining the State of Regional Grid Reliability.” The Subcommittee received testimony from:

- Gordon van Welie, President and Chief Executive Officer, ISO New England;
- Richard J. Dewey, President and Chief Executive Officer, New York Independent System Operator;
- Manu Asthana, President and Chief Executive Officer, PJM Interconnection LLC;
- Jennifer Curran, Senior Vice President for Planning and Operations, Midcontinent ISO;
- Lanny Nickell, Chief Operating Officer, Southwest Power Pool;
- Elliot Mainzer, President and Chief Executive Officer, California Independent System Operator and;
- Pablo Vegas, President and Chief Executive Officer, Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.

On April 9, 2025, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a full committee hearing on H.R. 1949. The title of the hearing was “The Energy Needs for Advancing American Technological Leadership.” The Committee received testimony from:

- Eric Schmidt, Chair, Special Competitive Studies Project;
- Manish Bhatia, Executive Vice President of Global Operations, Micron Technology;
- Alexander Wang, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Scale AI, and;
- David Turk, Distinguished Visiting Fellow, Center on Global Energy Policy, Columbia University.

On April 30, 2025, the Subcommittee on Energy held a legislative hearing on H.R. 1949. The title of the hearing was “Assuring Abundant, Reliable American Energy to Power Innovation.” The Subcommittee received testimony from:

- Mike Goff, Acting Undersecretary of Energy, U.S. Department of Energy;
- David L. Morenoff, Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;
- Terry Turpin, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;
- Jim Matheson, Chief Executive Officer, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association;
- Amy Andryszak, President and Chief Executive Officer, Interstate Natural Gas Association of America;
- Todd A. Snitchler, President and Chief Executive Officer, Electric Power Supply Association and;
- Kim Smaczniak, Partner, Roselle LLP.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII, the Committee adopts as its own the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. At the time this report was filed, the estimate was not available.

EARMARK, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, AND LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Pursuant to clause 9(e), 9(f), and 9(g) of rule XXI, the Committee finds that H.R. 1949 contains no earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act were created by this legislation.

APPLICABILITY TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 1. Short title

Section 1 provides the short title of “Unlocking Our Domestic LNG Potential Act.”

Section 2. Advancing United States global leadership

This section strikes the provisions within the Natural Gas Act that requires DOE to issue an authorization to export natural gas from the United States or import natural gas from a foreign country. This section clarifies that FERC shall have exclusive authority to approve or deny an application for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a facility to import or export natural gas.

This section requires FERC, in determining whether to approve or deny an application for a facility, to deem the export or import of the commodity, natural gas, to be consistent with the public interest. This section also contains a savings clause that clarifies nothing in the Act limits authorities under other laws to impose sanctions or restrict trade to a country that is designated as a state sponsor of terror.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

NATURAL GAS ACT

* * * * *

EXPORTATION OR IMPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS; LNG TERMINALS

SEC. 3. [(a) After six months from the date on which this act takes effect no person shall export any natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or import any natural gas from a foreign country without first having secured an order of the Commission authorizing it to do so. The Commission shall issue such order upon application, unless, after opportunity for hearing, it finds that the proposed exportation or importation will not be consistent with the public interest. The Commission may by its order grant such application, in whole or in part, with such modification and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may find necessary or appropriate, and may from time to time, after opportunity for hearing, and for good cause shown, make such supplemental order in the premises as it may find necessary or appropriate.

[(b) With respect to natural gas which is imported into the United States from a nation with which there is in effect a free trade agreement requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, and with respect to liquefied natural gas—

[(1) the importation of such natural gas shall be treated as a “first sale” within the meaning of section 2(21) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978; and

[(2) the Commission shall not, on the basis of national origin, treat any such imported natural gas on an unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential basis.

[(c) For purposes of subsection (a), the importation of the natural gas referred to in subsection (b), or the exportation of natural gas to a nation with which there is in effect a free trade agreement requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, shall be deemed to be consistent with the public interest, and applications for such importation or exportation shall be granted without modification or delay.

[(e)(1) The Commission shall have the exclusive authority to approve or deny an application for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of an LNG terminal. Except as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act is intended to affect otherwise applicable law related to any Federal agency’s authorities or responsibilities related to LNG terminals.]

(a)(1) The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (in this subsection referred to as the “Commission”) shall have the exclusive authority to approve or deny an application for authorization for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a facility to export natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or import natural gas from a foreign country, including an LNG terminal. In determining whether to approve or deny an application under this paragraph, the Commission shall deem the exportation or importation of natural gas to be consistent with the public interest. Except as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act is intended to affect otherwise applicable law related to any Federal agency’s authorities or responsibilities related to facilities to import or export natural gas, including LNG terminals.

(2) Upon the filing of any application to site, construct, expand, or operate an LNG terminal, the Commission shall—

(A) set the matter for hearing;

(B) give reasonable notice of the hearing to all interested persons, including the State commission of the State in which the LNG terminal is located and, if not the same, the Governor-appointed State agency described in section 3A;

(C) decide the matter in accordance with this subsection; and

(D) issue or deny the appropriate order accordingly.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Commission may approve an application described in paragraph (2), in whole or part, with such modifications and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission find necessary or appropriate.

(B) Before January 1, 2015, the Commission shall not—

(i) deny an application solely on the basis that the applicant proposes to use the LNG terminal exclusively or partially for gas that the applicant or an affiliate of the applicant will supply to the facility; or

(ii) condition an order on—

(I) a requirement that the LNG terminal offer service to customers other than the applicant, or any affiliate of the applicant, securing the order;

(II) any regulation of the rates, charges, terms, or conditions of service of the LNG terminal; or

(III) a requirement to file with the Commission schedules or contracts related to the rates, charges, terms, or conditions of service of the LNG terminal.

(C) Subparagraph (B) shall cease to have effect on January 1, 2030.

(4) An order issued for an LNG terminal that also offers service to customers on an open access basis shall not result in subsidization of expansion capacity by existing customers, degradation of service to existing customers, or undue discrimination against existing customers as to their terms or conditions of service at the facility, as all of those terms are defined by the Commission.

[(f)] (b)(1) In this subsection, the term “military installation”—

(A) means a base, camp, post, range, station, yard, center, or homeport facility for any ship or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility, that is located within a State, the District of Columbia, or any territory of the United States; and

(B) does not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbors projects, or flood control projects, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) The Commission shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of ensuring that the Commission coordinate and consult with the Secretary of Defense on the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of liquefied natural gas facilities that may affect an active military installation.

(3) The Commission shall obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense before authorizing the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of liquefied natural gas facilities affecting the training or activities of an active military installation.

[(d)] (c) Except as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects the rights of States under—

(1) the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.);

(2) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); or

(3) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(d)(1) *Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the President under the Constitution, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.), the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), or any other provision of law that imposes sanctions on a foreign person or foreign government (including any provision of law that prohibits or restricts United States persons from engaging in a transaction with a sanctioned person or government), including a country that is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, to prohibit imports or exports.*

(2) *In this subsection, the term “state sponsor of terrorism” means a country the government of which the Secretary of State determines has repeatedly provided support for international terrorism pursuant to—*

(A) section 1754(c)(1)(A) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4318(c)(1)(A));

(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(C) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

(D) any other provision of law.

* * * * *

MINORITY VIEWS

H.R. 1949 would automatically deem exports of natural gas “to be consistent with the public interest” and would remove any ability for the Department of Energy (DOE) to review natural gas exports to nations the United States lacks a free trade agreement with. The bill would increase costs for American families and cede an “energy dominance” agenda to China.

The Committee has repeatedly heard testimony that unfettered exports of liquified natural gas (LNG) would increase the price of both natural gas and electricity. In a hearing in 2023, Tyson Slocum, Energy Program Director at Public Citizen, testified that increased LNG exports have put upward pressure on the price Americans pay for heating and power. He also testified that incremental LNG exports would further tie American natural gas prices to international natural gas prices, exposing Americans to increased volatility and uncertainty in prices.¹ The Committee heard similar testimony a year later, when Gillian Giannetti, Senior Attorney at the Natural Resources Defense Council, stated that “LNG exports increase domestic energy prices and price volatility.”²

DOE also has published materials underscoring testimony received by the Committee. In 2023, the Energy Information Administration stated that “. . . higher LNG exports create a tighter domestic natural gas market (all else held equal), increasing domestic natural gas prices. Because of these two relationships, as the United States exports more LNG, the spread between domestic natural gas prices and international LNG prices eventually declines . . .”³ Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm concurred, writing that “. . . unfettered exports of LNG would increase wholesale domestic natural gas prices by over 30%. Unconstrained exports of LNG would increase costs for the average American household by well over \$100 more per year . . .”⁴ The evidence is clear: unrestricted LNG exports would increase energy prices for Americans, on top of the nearly \$300 in higher energy bills imposed by Republicans’ Big Ugly Bill.⁵

However, that is not all that unregulated LNG exports would do. The legislative record developed during Committee proceedings on the bill makes clear that the bill’s restrictions on sending LNG to

¹House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Testimony of Tyson Slocum, Director of the Energy Program, Public Citizen, *Hearing on Unleashing American Energy, Lowering Energy Costs, and Strengthening Supply Chains*, 118th Cong. (Feb. 7, 2023).

²House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Testimony of Gillian Giannetti, Senior Attorney, Natural Resources Defense Council, *Hearing on Politics Over People: How Biden’s LNG Export Ban Threatens America’s Energy and Economic Security*, 118th Cong. (Feb. 6, 2024).

³Energy Information Administration, *Issues in Focus: Effects of Liquified Natural Gas Exports on the U.S. Natural Gas Market* (May, 2023).

⁴Department of Energy, *Statement from U.S. Secretary of Energy Jennifer M. Granholm on Updated Final Analyses* (Dec. 16, 2024).

⁵Princeton University ZERO Lab, *Impacts of the One Big Beautiful Bill on the U.S. Energy Transition—Summary Report* (July 3, 2025).

sanctioned entities or entities covered by several statutes (the Emergency Economic Powers Act, the National Emergencies Act, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and the Trading With the Enemy Act) would not currently apply to LNG exports to China. Since 2018, American LNG exporters have signed 20 long term agreements with Chinese purchasers of LNG—including from projects still subject to DOE’s public interest determination that H.R. 1949 seeks to eliminate.⁶ If, as Chairman Brett Guthrie (R-KY) believes, that “Losing the race for AI to China is the equivalent of losing the Cold War to the Soviet Union,” then allowing China access to American energy resources could prove calamitous.⁷ Energy Subcommittee Ranking Member Kathy Castor (D-FL) attempted to remedy this defect in the bill by offering an amendment that would have restored the public interest determination requirement for LNG exports to China. It was defeated on a party-line vote, with every Republican present voting against the amendment.

Finally, the majority’s report notes that “The Committee finds that free trade, open markets, and competition have contributed to the rise of the U.S. as a global energy superpower. The Committee expects that lifting restrictions on the import and export of natural gas would contribute to net economic benefits, increased natural gas production, and improved energy security and national security for the American people and partners around the world.” Yet, the Trump Administration has imposed a ten percent tariff on imports of natural gas from Canada and Mexico that is increasing costs on American families in the Northeast and Northwest.⁸ Committee Democrats have pushed back against the Administration’s illegal efforts to increase prices on Americans. Republicans should start to do the same.

For the reasons stated above, I oppose this legislation.

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.
Ranking Member.

○

⁶Center for Strategic & International Studies, *US-China Trade War and the Future of U.S. LNG* (Apr. 29, 2025) (<https://www.csis.org/analysis/us-china-trade-war-and-future-us-lng>).

⁷Congressman Brett Guthrie (@CongressmanGuthrie), Facebook (Aug. 22, 2025, 3:21 PM) (https://www.facebook.com/CongressmanGuthrie/posts/losing-the-race-for-ai-to-china-is-the-equivalent-of-losing-the-cold-war-to-the-/13052792_00982898/).

⁸Natural Gas Intelligence, *Tariff Threats Cast Spotlight on U.S. Northeast-Canada Natural Gas Supply Relations. Prices—The Outlook* (May 2, 2025) (<https://naturalgasintel.com/news/tariff-threats-cast-spotlight-on-us-northeast-canada-natural-gas-supply-relations-prices-the-outlook/>).